5-1978

A Follow-Up Study of the Utah State University Business Education Graduates Receiving Bachelors Degrees, 1969-1976

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY BUSINESS EDUCATION GRADUATES RECEIVING BACHELORS DEGREES, 1969-1976

by

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Business Education

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A very special thanks is extended to Dr. Edward Houghton, chairman of my graduate committee, for the encouragement, patience, understanding and guidance offered throughout my graduate studies and the writing of this thesis.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Glen Marston and Dr. Lloyd Bartholome for their suggestions and assistance concerning the completion of my project.

Special gratitude is extended to the Department of Business Education at Utah State University for the financial assistance given me.

A warm thank you is extended to my office partners, Ron Houghton and Marsha Campbell for their friendship and encouraging words in time of need.

To my grandmother, Thelma Waddoups and her patient husband, Victor, I express my appreciation and love. Also, a special thanks to my husband, Dallin, and to my family for their patience, encouragement, and endurance throughout my entire graduate program.

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Table Page

Table Page

ABSTRACT

A Follow-Up Study of the Utah State University

Business Education Graduates

Receiving Bachelors Degrees, 1969-1976

by

Cynthia Olsen Krebs, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1976

Major Professor: Dr. Edward Houghton
Department: Business Education

The 1969 through 1976 graduating classes of the business education program at Utah State University were surveyed in this study. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the work experience of the graduates, the educational status of the graduates, and the value the graduates place on the courses contained in the business education program according to the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates are employed in a large variety of occupations, and the majority of the graduates hold teaching certificates. The majority of the graduates have not completed advanced degrees, and are undecided as to whether or not they will continue their education.

In all but five courses, the graduates' occupations were found to be unrelated to their response concerning the value of a course when the Chi Square Test was applied. The courses in which a significant difference at the .05 level of significance was found were:

(1) methods of teaching typewriting, (2) methods of teaching shorthand, (3) economics I, (4) office practice, and (5) office management.

The majority of the graduates indicated their preparation was "excellent" or "good". The members of the department of Business Education were listed as the greatest strength of the program by the graduates.

(133 pages)

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

The world is constantly changing, and innovations are taking place in all aspects of life.

> Changes in all facets of our society should be reflected by changes in the schools--in student activities, curricula and personnel. Similarly, at the university level, we must recognize and utilize not only change in the schools where our students will teach, but also change in the social and natural sciences and in the humanities about which we learn and teach. Our adaption to these forces for change should be guided by continuous evaluation of goals and processes, of needs and abilities, of resources and costs, and of time and place.[1]

"Postsecondary education is clearly at a point where old policies and planning strategies must be re-examined."[2] Curriculum must continually be updated to meet the needs of the student and the job market the student is entering.

By examining the status of the graduates of a program it is possible to generalize on the adequacy or inadequacy of an institution's curriculum. A follow-up study is "a systematic examination of the performance of former students in relation to goals and objectives of the educational

---

[1]Walter D. Talbot and Lerue Winger, Report to Utah State Board of Education on the Teacher Education Programs at Utah State University (Salt Lake City: Division of Staff Development, [1976]), p. 12.

[2]E. C. Pomeroy, "What's going on in Teacher Education: The View from Washington," Education Digest 41 (January 1976):70.

programs through which students were prepared."[3]

> The follow-up study investigates individuals who have left an institution after having completed a program, a treatment, or a course of study. The study is concerned with what has happened to them, and what has been the impact upon them of the institution and its programs.[4]

Utah State University's "Department of Business Education and Office Administration offers programs designed to prepare individuals as teachers and supervisors of distributive and office education subjects at all grade levels in the educational system."[5]

The test of any curriculum or program is the affect it has on the individual. The activities pursued by students after graduation are indicative of the value of preparation given them by the university program. To assure continued value of their programs, it is imperative that members of the university department have input from those concerned with the program in order to make a periodic study of progress.

Statement of the Problem

A follow-up study of the Utah State University Business Education graduates from 1969 through 1976 was conducted. The study was limited to graduates who received their Bachelors degrees.

Specifically, this study answered the following:

1. In what job classifications related to business have the graduates been employed since graduation, and what are their present occupations?

---

[3]Utah State Board for Vocational Education, Vocational Education Management Delivery Guide (Salt Lake City, [1976]), p. 12.

[4]John W. Best, Research in Education, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 134-135.

[5]Utah State University Bulletin, 1976-78 Catalog, Vol. 76 No. 7, July 1976, p. 74.

2. How much, and what kind of teaching experience do the graduates have?

3. What is the present educational status of the graduates?

4. What are the future educational plans of the graduates?

5. What do the graduates judge to be the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate business education program?

6. What is the degree of value graduates place on courses listed in the business education program according to the occupations of the graduates?

Need for the Study

One area of concern to educators today is "the shrinking public school population and a resultant decline in the demand for new teachers."[6]

> Student enrollment in elementary schools has been declining since 1970 and is expected to continue to do so throughout the 1980s. This drop in school age population has produced a lessened demand for new certificated classroom teachers. Only 2.4 million openings will appear in the 1970s while our institutions are preparing more than 4.2 million new teachers.[7]

"As the demand for additional teachers has decreased, the importance of enhancing programs for continuing professional development is apparent."[8] Enhanced programs that better prepare students is a major concern of universities that are looking to the future.

> It is clear that schools of education are mired in an era of fiscal change and uncertainty--uncertainty fostered by a changing and declining student demand for teacher preparation programs. Those schools of education which initiate positive

---

[6]R. O. Riggs, "Life-Saving Prescriptions for Schools of Education," Phi Delta Kappan 57 (January 1976):333.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Pomeroy, "What's Going on in Teacher Education: The View from Washington," p. 34.

> programs of faculty and curriculum development will have taken the first step toward fiscal stability. This step, coupled with an effective delineation of program priorities, could be a life-saver.[9]

A follow-up study is a method by which the university can evaluate the effectiveness of its programs. From the suggestions the university receives from its graduates, changes and additions can be implemented into university programs.

Joyce P. Heisick completed a follow-up study of the Utah State University Business Education, Distributive Education, and Office Administration graduates during the years 1959-1968. Her recommendation was that future follow-up studies be completed at Utah State University at intervals of no more than five years.[10]

During the spring of 1976 the Office of the Utah Board of Education published a Report to the Utah State Board of Education on the Teacher Education Programs at Utah State University. This report recommended to the Department of Business Education at Utah State University that a "follow-up program on graduates should be formalized so the the staff really knows what is happening to the students after they leave school."[11]

In accordance with the suggestions made by Joyce P. Heisick and the Utah State Board of Education, this study was conducted to investigate the activities of students graduating from Utah State University in business education during the years 1969 through 1976.

---

[9]Riggs, "Life-Saving Prescriptions for Schools of Education," p. 333.

[10]Joyce P. Heisick, "A Follow-up Study of the Utah State University Business Education, Distributive Education, and Office Administration Graduates, 1959 through 1968," (Master's Thesis, Utah State University, 1969), p. 85.

[11]Walter D. Talbot and Lerue Winger, Report to Board of Education, 33.

With this information, members of the department will know how many graduates are employed; the field in which they are employed; what teaching experience the graduates have had, and the future educational plans of the graduates. The members of the department will then be in a position to evaluate the over-all program and make a determination of its value or need for change.

Scope of the Study

This study was restricted to those students who graduated from Utah State University in Business Education between the years 1969 and 1976.

The study is limited because the validity of the questionnaire could be impaired due to misinterpretations of questions by the respondents.

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of terms used in this study:

Business Education Graduates. Those students who completed the course of study required by the Department of Business Education to qualify them for certification to teach business and office education subjects. Upon completion of the program the students received a Bachelor of Science degree from Utah State University.

Curriculum. The aggregate of courses of study given in a school, college, or university.

Follow-up Study. An investigation of the activities of individuals who have left an institution after having completed a program, a treatment, or a course of study.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to complete a follow-up study of business education graduates of Utah State University from 1969 through 1976.

A review of related literature is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III contains the methods and procedures used to conduct the follow-up survey. Chapter IV contains the findings and Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Comprehensive follow-up studies have been made to investigate individuals who have completed an educational program. These studies are undertaken in many cases to receive the graduates' input in the evaluation and revision of curricula, but have been put to use in other areas as well.

This chapter includes a brief history of follow-up studies as they relate to Business Education, and some of the follow-up studies used for various reasons in secondary and post-secondary education.

History

A study was conducted by Robert Arnold Lowry[12] in 1958 to develop a body of principles to serve as a guide in making follow-up studies. Although he limited his study to follow-up surveys of high school business graduates, the principles he developed can be of assistance to all who utilize the follow-up study in their research.

Lowry also included in his study a history of surveys in Business Education. Important surveys discussed in his study will be cited here.

A historical record of the development of follow-up studies contributes to our knowledge of follow-up surveys and gives us a more

---

[12]Robert Arnold Lowry, "Principles of Follow-Up Research in Business Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1958).

complete background for current surveys. The following information begins with the earliest published reports of follow-up studies in the professional literature of education.

The follow-up study represents a relatively recent application of social survey techniques. The ideas of the social survey can be traced back to 1745. That schools should be guided by the results of social surveys has been recommended for years.

Howard T. Lewis of the University of Idaho wrote in 1914 "that the social survey is so important in giving direction to the work of the rural school that teachers should take the initiative in starting survey projects."[13] Certainly this is as applicable today in all schools as it was in 1914.

One of the earliest recorded surveys which was a form of a follow-up study was completed in 1894. This was a survey of the graduates of the St. Louis Manual Training School and was undertaken by C. M. Woodward. Woodward acknowledged the danger of overestimating the value of a study of careers of graduates, and recognized that many factors other than schooling influence the careers of young men. At the same time, however, he observed that "it is evident to all that we must and do judge schools and systems by the men they turn out."[14]

A generation passed after this before a noticeable number of reports of similar studies began to appear. Most of these early studies and follow-up surveys were related closely to guidance services in secondary education.

---

[13]Howard T. Lewis, "The Social Survey in Rural Education," Educational Review 48 (October 1914):273-274.

[14]C. M. Woodward, "Present Occupations of the Graduates of the St. Louis Manual Training School, October, 1894," Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1893-1894, Vol. 1, Pt. 2, (Washington, D.C. United State Government Printing Office, 1896), p. 935.

The majority of these reports dealt in the most part with out of school youth and dropouts.

One of the first follow-up surveys of college graduates was completed by Frederick Paul Keppel, Dean of Columbia College, New York, in 1910. Dean Keppel was interested in determining the extent to which the life-career choices of college men were influenced by the experiences these men had as undergraduates in college. Questionnaires were sent to graduates to obtain this information. Keppel's investigation was among the first to perceive that formal education, even on the college level, might be improved through the use of information obtained from the graduate.[15]

Two reports of the "Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education" are of particular significance in the development of follow-up studies. These two reports, one on Business Education in Secondary Schools and the other on Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education, urged making surveys. Business Education in Secondary Schools suggested surveying business for the purpose of determining the kinds of education needed.[16] Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education emphasized the value of using information obtained through follow-up activities of students as a basis for curriculum revision.

---

[15]Frederick Paul Keppel, "The Occupations of College Graduates as Influenced by the Undergraduate Course," Educational Review 40 (December 1910):433-439.

[16]U.S. Department of Interior, Business Education in Secondary Schools, by the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Bulletin 55 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919).

[17]U.S. Department of Interior, Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education, by the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Bulletin 19, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918).

In 1927 Frederick J. Weersing completed a report of a comprehensive investigation of commercial education in the public schools of Minnesota. This investigation used data that had been gathered from graduates through the use of a questionnaire. This report was published by several professional journals and was widely distributed. Because it was favorably recognized, it served to stimulate interest in making follow-up surveys in Business Education. It influenced the purpose, techniques, form, and content of many later surveys.[18]

In 1929 Shepard Young completed An Occupational Survey of the Commercial Graduates of three High Schools of Terre Haute, Indiana. This follow-up study was the first in graduate research in which all the data for use in evaluating a curriculum was obtained from the graduates of that curriculum.[19]

Not all the studies that were completed before 1931 have been mentioned. There were many more. By the 1930's reports of follow-up surveys could no longer be considered novel. It was being realized what an important method of evaluating a curriculum follow-up surveys could be.

The remainder of this chapter dealing with related literature will be devoted to current follow-up studies in Business Education.

The following studies were conducted at the secondary level from information gleaned from graduates.

---

[18]Frederick J. Weersing, "A Study of Certain Aspects of Commercial Education in the Public High Schools of Minnesota (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967).

[19]Shepard Young, "An Occupational Survey of the Commercial Graduates of Three High Schools of Terre Haute, Indiana" (Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1929).

Follow-up Studies at the Secondary Level

Wandmacher study

James L. Wandmacher[20] conducted a survey of the 1968 through 1972 Burnsville Senior High School Office Education Graduates to obtain their assistance in a curriculum revision.

The graduates were surveyed by the use of a questionnaire, and those respondents who were either currently working in an office position or who had previous office experience were used for the tabulation of the data of the study. Of the 244 graduate returns possible, 39 responses were used. A total of 152 were actually received back.

Wandmacher found that the courses the respondents felt to be most valuable to them in their careers were office procedures and shorthand. Eighty percent of the respondents felt that they were qualified for their first job due to the preparation in business education they had received at Burnsville High School.

The graduates were asked to respond to an open-ended question concerning suggestions for curriculum improvement. The responses in this area were many and varied, but a large number of the graduates indicated more work could be given in the area of office behavior--how to get along with fellow employees.

Wandmacher also discovered that the teachers and counselors of Burnsville High School students were the most often used source of job information.

---

[20]James L. Wandmacher, "A Follow-up Study of 1968-1972 Burnsville Senior High School Office Education Graduates with Implications for Curriculum Revisions." (Masters thesis, University of Minnesota [Minneapolis] 1974).

Ryan study

The purpose of Margaret Ryan's study[21] was to determine the status of the graduates of Campbell County High School who completed two years of shorthand. Of the graduates receiving questionnaires, 120 out of a possible 136 graduates responded.

The graduates' high school training was considered "essential" in preparing them for their present jobs. The class Typewriting II was ranked as the most important subject pertaining to work experience.

Eighty percent of the graduates had been employed in an office since graduation. One third of the graduates indicated that shorthand was a requirement for their initial employment, while 82 percent said that typewriting was a requirement.

When asked if shorthand was required on their present jobs, 34.8 percent of the respondents indicated it was. Typewriting was indicated as required by 76.7 percent of the respondents.

Hawkins study

Calvin H. Hawkins[22] decided to utilize a follow-up study of high school graduates to find how select units of consumer education were being used by these students after their high school graduation.

For this study, two groups were chosen. Group 1 was made up of those graduates who had taken a consumer education course as a senior. Group 2 was selected from the remaining seniors who had not taken the

---

[21]Margaret Ryan, "A Follow-up Study of the 1970 through 1974 Graduates of Campbell County High School who Completed 2 Years of Shorthand" (Masters thesis, Morehead State University, 1975).

[22]Calvin H. Hawkins, "A Follow-Up Study to Determine the Use of Selected Consumer Education Concepts by High School Graduates" (Ph. D. thesis, University of Northern Colorado, 1975).

course. These students were selected from ten schools of differing size. A questionnaire was mailed to the graduates concerning three areas: money management, credit, and borrowing. An 81 percent return was achieved.

A significant difference between the two groups of graduates was found in only one question. From this Hawkins concluded that a consumer education course had little or no significant effect upon the responses given by graduates two years after completing the course when compared to the responses given by a similar group who had not taken the course.

In this case, a follow-up study proved valuable in determining if a course was actually accomplishing its goals.

As shown by these studies, a follow-up of high school graduates can provide valuable information that can be used in a curriculum revision or a course evaluation.

Follow-up Studies at the Post Secondary-Level

The studies that follow were conducted at the post-secondary level of education.

Cofield study

Lois S. Cofield completed a follow-up study of the 1967 through 1971 business graduates of Hampton Institute to obtain data that would aid in the evaluation of the business program at Hampton Institute.[23]

Two questionnaires were administered in this study. Questionnaire One determined the graduates whose first employment was in business and the subsequent duties performed on the first job. From the responses to this

---

[23]Lois S. Cofield, "An Evaluation Follow-Up Study of Hampton Institute Business Graduates of 1967-1971" (Ed. D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1964).

questionnaire, additional duties were listed for use in the second questionnaire. Questionnaire Two was constructed to enable graduates to evaluate the curriculum based on their first job duties.

Cofield found that graduates who obtained their first jobs in the secretarial and office-related occupations rated business administration courses as having significantly less value in preparing them for their first jobs than the value ratings given to business administration courses by other occupational groups.

Whitted study

Mildred M. Whitted [24] conducted a survey of business students who graduated from Forest Park Community College between 1963 and 1972. It was designed to ascertain the characteristics of individuals who had completed the various programs in business education, to determine what courses graduates found most relevant to their career pursuits; to ascertain the kinds of office equipment in use, to obtain information on starting salary ranges, and to solicit suggestions for curriculum change.

A questionnaire was sent to the graduates who had completed the following business programs: business administration, hotel and motel management, medical office assistant, secretarial, data processing, clerk-typist, accounting, and some others. Response to the survey was 46 percent.

The courses that the business graduates found most relevant to their careers were English and grammar, human relations, public speaking, math,

---

[24]Mildred M. Whitted, "The Relevance of College Experiences: A Survey of Business Students" Business Education World V. 54 No. 4 (March, 1974):29.

psychology, and typewriting. The classes indicated to be the least valuable were duplicating, history, and physical eduction. Responses to an open-ended question concerning suggestions for curriculum improvement were quite varied. Some of the most often made suggestions were: (1) to work toward a closer articulation between the various teachers and departments, (2) employment be provided in each program and (3) to have yearly follow-up studies and provide the graduates with the information received.

Whitted found that 46 percent of the graduates indicated that they used manual typewriters in their work, while only 10 percent reported they used electric typewriters. Most respondents stated that they used shorthand infrequently, and only 10 percent indicated that they transcribed machine-recorded dictation. The calculator was the most frequently used office machine.

Seventy percent of the graduates reported that they were employed full time, and 10 percent indicated they were employed part-time. Over 95 percent of the graduates responding were in the St. Louis area for employment.

This survey shows that a follow-up study can be useful in obtaining information in areas other than curriculum, particularly as an indication as the whether a school is in tune with changes in business.

Anderson study

A follow-up study of the Commercial Division Graduates of Coastal Carolina Community College for the years 1969 through 1973 was conducted by Lynne Anderson.[25] The purpose of this study was to provide feedback

---

[25]Lynne K. Anderson, "A Follow-Up Study of the Commercial Division Graduates of Coastal Carolina Community College for the Years 1969 Through 1973," (Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1975).

on the business curriculum at Coastal Carolina Community College. A 59 percent response was received.

Anderson found that the majority of the graduates remained in North Carolina after graduation. Salaries were considerably lower for beginning secretaries--the secretaries all being female--than for beginning males. It was also found that secretarial science graduates made a rather rapid increase in salary although they remained lower than the male business administration graduates.

The majority of the graduates were satisfied with the program, although a few expressed a degree of dissatisfaction. About half of the graduates indicated that they worked for a small organization while nearly as many indicated a large organization.

This follow-up study provided the college with meaningful information concerning the employment of the graduates, providing a different sort of information for curriculum revision.

Roberts study

To determine the adequacy of the secretarial and clerical programs of the Arkansas area vocational-technical schools in preparing students for initial employment in secretarial and clerical occupations, Donald Roberts[26] conducted this study.

The data used in this study was obtained from three sources: (1) the 1971-1974 employed graduates of the secretarial and clerical programs, (2) secretarial and clerical teachers in the Arkansas area vocational-technical schools and (3) employers of the graduates.

---

[26]Donald Rue Roberts, "An Assessment of the Secretarial and Clerical Programs in the Area Vocational-Technical Schools of Arkansas," (Ed. D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1975).

The data was received from 80 percent of the graduates, from 134 of their employers, and from all 34 secretarial and clerical teachers of the Arkansas vocational-technical schools.

Roberts found that the graduates, employers, and teachers were not in agreement on the graduates' ability to perform 12 of the skills studied. The three groups had similar perceptions of the graduates' ability to typewrite with speed, but disagreed on the graduates' ability to operate copy machines, ability to use the telephone, and ability to file. Employers rated the graduates higher in these areas than did teachers. Graduates and teachers rated graduates as being more satisfactory than did employers.

Good business ethics was rated as the most satisfactory understanding of the graduate, and procedure for travel arrangements was rated as the least satisfactory. Graduates, employers, and teachers were not in agreement on the extent which graduates had developed dependability in performing duties, courtesy and pleasantness in manner, personal appearance and grooming, willingness to follow directions, judgment and common sense in work, and attendance and punctuality.

This study involved a follow-up of graduates that was joined with information gleaned from employers of the graduates and teachers to provide information on the adequacy of the secretarial and clerical programs of the area vocational schools of Arkansas. This information could be valuable in program revisions.

Kaisershot study

Alfred L. Kaisershot[27] completed a study in June, 1970, to follow up graduates of the business teacher education program at the University of

[27]Alfred L. Kaisershot, "An Appraisal of the Undergraduate Business Teacher Education Program at the University of Nebraska; A Follow-Up of the Graduates, 1959-69" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1970).

Nebraska from the years 1959 through 1969. The main purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the undergraduate business teacher education program at the university and to determine specific strengths and weaknesses.

Questionnaires were sent to graduates, and a response rate of 76 percent was achieved Forty-three percent of the graduates were teachers, and 28 percent were housewife/homemakers. Some form of graduate work had been completed by 45 percent of the graduates, and only 12 percent of the graduates had completed their graduate work.

A list of 34 technical business subjects was included on the questionnaire, and the graduate was to indicate whether the subject "should be required" or "should not be required." Three subjects, salesmanship, credits and collections, and retail store management, were marked "should be required" by over 100 percent of the graduates. This is due to the fact that more graduates indicated "should be required" than had taken the class. Two classes were marked "should not be required". They were cost accounting and evolution of business and capitalism.

Classes of "greatest value" were: (1) marketing problems, (2) principles of insurance, (3) office machines II, (4) electronic data processing, and (5) business law.

Business teacher education subjects that "should be required" included: (1) methods of teaching bookkeeping, (2) student teaching, (3) methods of teaching shorthand and typewriting, (4) methods of bookkeeping and general business, and (5) methods of distributive education.

The two classes that the graduates indicated they would most like to see added to the business teacher program were data processing and computer programing. The three business subjects the graduates believed

they were best qualified to teach were, in order: (1) typewriting, (2) shorthand, and (3) bookkeeping. The subjects the graduates felt least qualified to teach were: (1) business law and (2) economics.

Those areas of competency rated as "fair to poor" by over half the graduates were counseling of students in class, handling of discipline cases, and working with parents.

Kaisershot concluded that the strengths of the business teacher education program at the University of Nebraska were the faculty, the methods courses, skills courses, and the student teaching program. Weaknesses included business administration courses, some of the professional education courses and the lack of some methods courses in specific areas.

He recommended that the business teacher education faculty encourage majors to enroll in business administration subjects to provide the best possible preparation for teaching basic business and economic education at the secondary schools.

Grovom study

Evelyn L. Grovom's study[28] in 1968 was conducted to evaluate the business teacher education curricula in colleges based on the opinions of the business teachers in the public high schools in the state of Minnesota. The purpose of Grovom's investigation was to determine whether or mot the business teacher education curriculum was meeting the needs of the high school business teachers.

A total of 479 teachers participated in the study. Of this group 64 percent were male and 35 percent were female. Seventy-six percent

---

[28]Evelyn L. Grovom, "An Evaluation of the Business Teacher Education Curricula in Colleges Based on the Opinions of the Business Teachers in the Public High Schools in the State of Minnesota," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968).

of these business teachers had majored in business. The remaining had majored in various fields.

It is interesting to note that while typewriting was the course listed as the one teachers most often taught, it was also listed as the one they least enjoyed teaching. The course listed as the most enjoyable to teach was bookkeeping. More teachers felt qualified to teach general business than any other high school business course.

The teachers were asked if they felt adequately prepared to teach the various business classes generally offered in a high school curriculum. In descending order, the classes that over 50 percent of the teachers felt adequately prepared to teach were: (1) bookkeeping, (2) typewriting, (3) consumer education, (4) business principles, (5) business law, (6) shorthand, (7) economics, and (8) business math. Less than half (45 percent) of the teachers felt adequately prepared to teach office machines; followed by economic geography, retail or general salesmanship, and occupational relations.

Four separate and different methods of teaching classes were preferred by 60 percent of the teachers. The teachers also stated they had their strongest preparation in typewriting and shorthand, and that they had had separate methods courses in these two subjects.

Less than half the business teachers said that they had received instruction and information pertaining to guidance procedures in their undergraduate program. Forty percent said they had not received and information in the area of guidance. Even so, with the lack of training, 75 percent of the business teachers reported they were involved in the area of guidance.

When asked why they did not feel qualified in the area of basic business, the majority of the teacher s gave one of the following reasons:

(1) lack of required basic business courses in the business education curriculum, (2) too many required courses other than business, or (3) a lack of methods courses.

Grovom concluded from the percentages she received that there is a definite need for improvement in the preparation of business education teachers in all areas. She recommended that the weak areas pointed out in the study be strenthened through curriculum improvements.

Wells study

In 1971 Barron Wade Wells conducted a study to obtain the appraisals of selected business teacher education graduates around the nation to investigate whether business teacher programs throughout the nation were adequately preparing their graduates to teach subjects in the business administration area.[29]

Wells mailed out 1,542 questionnaires to graduates identified by the National Associations for Business Teacher Education Representatives. Returns were 54.8 percent of the mailing, or 7.84 percent of the total estimated population of business teachers.

The questionnaire that was sent to the teacher consisted of nine sections, each dealing with a specific subject under business administration. Each subject had subtopics related to the skills and knowledges that Wells determined were necessary for teaching the different subjects in a high school. His determination of necessary topics was based on the fact that the topics were found in the most commonly used high school business textbooks across the nation.

---

[29]Barron Wade Wells, "The Business Teacher Education Curriculum: University of Houston," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1971).

Business education graduates felt insufficiently prepared to teach 73.3 percent of the topics under management, 60.4 percent of the topics under marketing, 63.3 percent of the topics under finance, 83.3 percent of the topics under statistics and 85.2 percent of the topics under data processing.

Business education graduates felt sufficiently prepared to teach 86.3 percent of the topics under economics, 94.1 percent of the topics under accounting, 80.4 percent of the topics under business law, and 85.2 percent of the topics under communications.

Wells concluded that, in general, preparation to teach the business administration topics established in his investigation as being necessary for a well prepared business teacher was inadequate. He feels that business administration courses in the teacher preparation programs across the nation are not adequately providing the skills and knowledge that are necessary to enable the high school business teacher to teach those topics. His conclusion is based on the large number of insufficient ratings that were marked by his sample.

Cressy study

Charles L. Cressy[30] appraised the undergraduate Business Education programs at Chadron State College, basing his appraisal on a follow-up of the graduates of that institution from January 1965 through May 1974. The purpose of his study was to survey the graduates of the Division of Business Education to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of the programs at the college as perceived by the graduates.

---

[30]Charles L. Cressy, "An Appraisal of the Undergraduate Business Education Programs at Chadron State College Based on a Follow-up of the Graduates from January, 1965 through May, 1974," (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1974).

Of the 176 questionnaires mailed, 166 were returned (95 percent). Of the 166 questionnaires returned, 115 graduates were teaching. Only the questionnaires from these graduates were used in the evaluation.

The following is a summary of the findings:

1. The business education programs which included stenography were the most popular programs.

2. A majority of the graduates were vocationally approved/approvable or planned to become vocationally approved in the near future.

3. Approximately two-thirds of the graduates viewed business education as vocational, general, and exploratory education.

4. Typewriting was the most frequently taught business course.

5. Special methods of business education was the course having the greatest value to graduates in their teaching of business education.

6. Over three-fourths of the graduates felt that 36 of the 39 business courses were of value to them in their teaching of business education.

7. Over three-fourths of the graduates felt all 10 of the professional courses were of value to them in their teaching of business subjects.

8. The majority of graduates felt there was inadequate time for special methods of business education and that the course should be a semester in length or that another special methods course should be added to allow time for instruction in skills and nonskills courses.

9. The majority of graduates were satisfied with student teaching.

10. The graduates felt least qualified and least prepared to teach business law, economics, and general business.

11. The graduates felt best qualified and most preferred to teach typewriting, bookkeeping/accounting, and shorthand.

12. English was the most frequently suggested minor for future business eudcation graduates.

Shipman study

Meada Gibbs Shipman[31] completed a study of the graduates who earned Bachelor Degrees in Business in 1964, 1965, 1969, and 1970 from four predominantly black universities. This study was patterned for comparison with the Kreul (1972) study of predominantly white business graduates from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The purpose of the Shipman study was to secure data relating to: (a) career objectives as college freshman; (b) major fields of study as undergraduates; (c) legal residences upon graduation and present residences; (d) age and sex; (e) postbachelor studies; (f) job leads secured at the time of graduation; (g) occupations since graduation; (h) factors influencing job choices and reasons for leaving employment; (i) types and sizes of organizations in which employed; (j) salaries; (k) evaluation of their undergraduate education by the graduates.

The questionnaire was sent to 907 graduates of four predominantly black universities. There were 423 male graduates and 484 female graduates in this study. Responses were received from 157 (37.1 percent) of the males, and 167 (34.5 percent) of the female graduates. In the Kreul study, 1,495 (65.5 percent) of the 2,280 male graduates and 124 (63.9 percent) of the 194 female graduates participated in the study.

The highest percentages of black males majored in business administration; and black females in business education. Highest percentages

---

[31]Meado Gibbs Shipman, "A Study of the Graduates Who Earned Bachelor Degrees in Business in 1964, 1965, 1969, and 1970 from Four Predominantly Black Universities, "Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconson at Madison, 1973).

of white males and females, as reported by Kreul, majored in accounting, finance, management, and marketing.

About 75 percent of the black males and females and about 50 percent (Kreul) of the white males and females planned to earn business degrees as entering freshmen.

Black male and female respondents rated English composition, white male and female respondents rated computer science, as the nonbusiness subject of the most value. All four groups ranked speech and mathematics as second and third in value.

Black male respondents ranked business communication, accounting, and office procedures-machines as the business subjects of most value. Black females listed typewriting, office procedures-machines, and business communication as most valuable. White business students (male and female) gave highest rankings to accounting, data processing, and business communication.

Even though business respondents in this and the Kreul study indicated general satisfaction with their careers, it was found that black business graduates were somewhat less satisfied than whites. Black females were least satisfied among the groups studied.

Advanced degrees were earned by 6.3 percent of the black male respondents and 9 percent of the black female respondents, while 25 percent of the white male respondents and 6 percent of the white female respondents earned advanced degrees. Only 2 (4.8) percent of the black males who majored in accounting (and none of the females) had earned CPA certificates, while 49.3 percent of the white male accounting majors and 17.2 percent of the white female accounting majors in the Kreul study had earned CPA certificates.

Heisick study

Joyce P. Heisick conducted a follow-up study of business education, office administration, and distributive education graduates receiving bachelors degrees from Utah State University during the years of 1959 through 1968.[32] A questionnaire was sent to 272 graduates, and 177 responses were received. This was a response rate of 65.1 percent.

Of the graduates responding, 42.3 percent were teaching, 22.0 percent were employed in business and 30.5 percent were employed in other occupations.

With regard to further education, 105 (59.3 percent) of the graduates indicated they planned on graduate work, while 47 (26.5 percent) were undecided. Twenty-five (14.1 percent) of the graduates stated they did not intend further class work. Only 25 (14.4 percent) of the graduates had received advanced degrees since graduation, and none had received a degree above the masters.

The strengths of the business education, office education, professional education, business administration, accounting, and economics programs were: (1) quality of instruction, (2) appropriate subject matter, and (3) depth of coverage. Audio Visual instruction was listed as a weakness in all programs.

The courses evaluated by the graduates as the most beneficial were the typing series, office practice, dictation and transcription series, methods of teaching shorthand transcription, business communications, student teaching, methods of teaching distributive education and cooperative education, philosophy of D. E., economics 51 and 52, and accounting.

32Joyce P. Heisick, "A Follow-Up Study of the Utah State University Business Education, Distributive Education, and Office Administration Graduates, 1959-1968," (Masters thesis, Utah State University, 1969).

The courses evaluated by the graduates to be least beneficial were office data systems, principles of business education, insurance, social security, and principles of secondary education.

Heisick recommended that the objectives and course content of the classes that were rated least beneficial be re-evaluated by the university to make these courses more meaningful to the graduates.

Summary

Throughout the years, follow-up studies of graduates have proved to be valuable instruments for gaining information. One of the main uses of the follow-up study is to obtain information through which improvements in existing educational programs can be made. The findings of these follow-up studies have assisted the administrators in locating and correcting areas of strengths and weaknesses in a curriculum.

Because follow-up studies are valuable in the evaluation and revision of a program, Arnold Lowry in 1958 developed a set of principles to follow when planning and administering a survey of this nature.

A review of the literature in the area of business teacher education curriculum reveals certain areas that are weak and need more attention in curriculum planning.

The main weakness as indicated by a number of the studies was inadequate preparation of the business graduate to teach business administration topics. A general recommendation to universities would be to encourage business education graduates to enroll in Business Administration subjects to provide them with the skills and knowledge they need for teaching basic business subjects and economic education in secondary schools.

Another area mentioned frequently in which additional training is needed was guidance and counseling of students. Many of the teachers indicated they were involved in classroom counseling and would have liked more training in this area.

Other areas mentioned that need improvement are professional education classes, handling of discipline problems, and working with parents. In some studies, a lack of some methods of teaching courses was considered to be a serious weakness.

Data gathered from graduates of business education teacher preparation programs regarding the adequacy of their preparation to teach subject matter in the high school business courses can be of value to business teacher educators in planning and revising their business teacher preparation programs. For this reason, follow-up studies should be implemented in the universities.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The need for follow-up studies of Business Education graduates has been shown. This study was a survey of the total number of graduates that received their Bachelor of Science degree from Utah State University and majored in Business Education during the years of 1969 through 1976.

The methods and procedures employed in this study will be described under the following divisions: (1) subject and sampling procedure, (2) developing and testing the questionnaire, (3) collection of data, and (4) analysis of data.

Subject and Sampling Procedure

The names of all the graduates of Business Education during the years 1969 through 1976 were obtained from the records of the Department of Business Education and Office Administration of Utah State University. Only those graduates receiving their bachelors degree were surveyed.

The names of the graduates were listed alphabetically by the year of graduation. During the period covered, 225 students graduated with Bachelor of Science degrees in Business Education from Utah State University.

The addresses of the graduates were obtained from the Utah State University Office of Admissions and Records, the Utah State University Placement Center, the Utah State University Alumni Association, the Utah State University Business Education and Office Administration Department,

and in some instances from the friends and relatives of the graduates. In some cases, no address was available.

Each graduate was asked to respond to a questionnaire.

Developing and Testing the Questionnaire

A pilot study of the questionnaire was completed before it was sent to the total population. The purpose of the pilot study was to indicate any flaws in the construction of the questionnaire, any unclear questions and any questions that could have been misinterpreted by the graduate.

The pilot questionnaire was sent to 15 graduates. The graduates were encouraged to identify any questions, problems, suggestions, or improvements as they completed the questionnaire. Of the 15 questionnaires sent, 9 (60 percent) were returned.

Using the suggestions of the participants in the pilot study, the instructions on several questions were clarified, and an open-ended question was added.

The final questionnaire, as sent to the graduates, was constructed to cover the objectives listed in Chapter I. It consisted of three sections: (1) employment of the graduate, (2) educational background and future plans of the graduate, and (3) opinion of the graduate toward his undergraduate program and classwork.

Collection of Data

The data collected for this study came from the mailed questionnaire. On February 28, 1977, each graduate was sent the revised questionnaire (see Appendix, page 97), a cover letter of explanation (see Appendix, page 93) signed by Dr. Ted Ivarie (Department Head,

Business Education and Office Administration, Utah State University). A stamped, pre-addressed return envelope was mailed for the respondent's convenience. After 5 weeks, approximately a 48 percent return had been received.

The first follow-up was mailed on April 18 to the graduates who had not responded. A cover letter (see Appendix, page 94) and a duplicate questionnaire with a stamped, addressed return envelope were mailed. After 4 weeks, approximately a 67 percent return had been received.

On May 16, the second follow-up letter (see Appendix, page 95) and duplicate questionnaire were mailed to non-respondents. Approximately a 69 percent return had been received after 2 weeks.

On June 1, June 22, and July 15, the third, fourth, and fifth follow-up letters and questionnaires were mailed. (see Appendix, page 96) These were personalized letters asking for direct assistance by filling out the questionnaire. The fifth letter was preceded by telephone calls to all graduates with available telephone numbers. These brought approximate returns of 71, 73, and 75 percent, respectively.

A deadline of Monday, August 1, was established for the return of the questionnaires. A total of 169 or 75.1 percent of the questionnaires had been returned by the deadline date.

Analysis of Data

Data obtained from the returns were punched on cards for use in the Utah State University computer. The program was run on the computer to give accurate tabulation and correct computation of data.

Frequency counts, percentages, cross-tabulations, and Chi Square (X^2) tests were used to report and analyze the data. A frequency count is the incidence of occurence of a particular item, and a percentage is the number-per-hundred compared. Cross-tabulations show items referenced against other items. A Chi Square test of independence tests the relationship between two variables.

Frequency counts, some cross-tabulations, and Chi Square (X^2) tests were compiled and computed on the computer. Percentages and other cross-tabulations were tabulated manually.

Summary

Names and addresses of the graduates were obtained from various university sources and the data were secured from the graduates by use of a mailed questionnaire.

A pilot study was used as a pre-test of the questionnaire to detect flaws in the construction of the questionnaire. Following the initial mailing of the questionnaire, five follow-ups were conducted.

The data from the returns were tabulated using the Utah State University computer. The findings of the data are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the questionnaires administered for this study. The majority of the answers have been tabulated, and are presented in tabular form.

The findings are presented as follows: (1) questionnaire replies, (2) employment, (3) education, and (4) program evaluation.

Questionnaire Replies

One hundred sixty-nine questionnaires were returned out of a possible 225. Of these, 165 were useable, constituting a 73.3 percent return. This study was a direct-mail survey and the total population included bachelors degree graduates in business education from 1969 through 1976.

Table 1 shows the number of respondents by year of graduation. The largest percentage of return was 88.9 percent by the graduates of 1976. The 1971 graduates had the lowest return of 56.8 percent. An upward trend is noticeable starting in 1972.

Employment

The section covering the employment of the graduates was to determine: (1) the present occupation of the graduates, (2) the teaching experience of the graduates, and (3) the experience of the graduates in related job areas.

Table 1. Number and percent of replies by year of graduation

Year of Graduation	Number of Graduates	Number of Replies	Percent
1969	26	17	65.4
1970	32	26	81.3
1971	37	21	56.8
1972	28	20	71.4
1973	37	27	73.0
1974	23	18	78.3
1975	24	20	83.3
1976	18	16	88.9
TOTALS	225	165	73.3

An examination of Table 2, which indicates the present employment of the graduates, shows 30 graduates, or 18.2 percent are presently teaching. Forty-six graduates, or 27.9 percent, are employed in business. Ten graduates, or 6.1 percent, are employed in other occupations. Twenty graduates, or 12.1 percent, indicated they were employed in two or more of the above occupations. No response was given by 59 graduates, or 35.8 percent of the respondents.

The year with the highest percentage of graduates teaching is 1972 with 35 percent (7 graduates) teaching. The year 1970 has the lowest percentage of graduates teaching with 11.5 percent (3 graduates) teaching. This is followed closely by 1969 with 11.8 percent (2) graduates teaching.

Table 2. Present employment of the graduate by the year of graduation

Year of Graduation	No Response		Type of Employment							
			Teaching		Business		Other		Two or More	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1969	5	29.4	2	11.8	7	41.2	1	5.9	2	11.8
1970	7	26.9	3	11.5	8	30.8	1	3.8	7	26.9
1971	5	23.8	3	14.3	9	42.9	1	4.8	3	14.9
1972	5	25.0	7	35.0	5	25.0	1	5.0	2	10.0
1973	10	37.0	5	18.5	8	29.6	2	7.4	2	7.4
1974	6	33.3	3	16.7	5	27.8	1	5.6	3	16.7
1975	11	55.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	1	5.0
1976	10	62.5	4	25.0	1	6.3	1	6.3	0	0.0
TOTALS	59	35.8	30	18.2	46	27.9	10	6.1	20	12.1

Table 3 indicates the number and percent of graduates presently holding, having held, and never having held a teaching certificate. Graduates now holding teaching certificates number 130 (78.8 percent). Those graduates who do not hold a teaching certificate at the present time, but who have held one in the past, number 28 (17.0 percent). Seven graduates (4.2 percent) indicated they have never held a teaching certificate.

The lowest percentage of graduates now holding a teaching certificate occurs in 1970 with 11 graduates (42.3 percent). The highest percentage of graduates now holding a certificate occurs in 1974 and 1975, both with 100 percent of the graduates holding the certificate.

Table 3. Graduates presently holding, having held, and never held a teaching certificate

Year of Graduation	Now Hold Certificate		Have Held Certificate		Have Not Held Certificate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1969	10	58.8	7	41.2	0	0.0
1970	11	42.3	11	42.3	4	15.4
1971	12	57.1	8	38.1	1	4.8
1972	18	90.0	1	5.0	1	5.0
1973	26	96.3	1	3.7	0	0.0
1974	18	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1975	20	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1976	15	93.8	0	0.0	1	6.3
TOTALS	130	78.8	28	17.0	7	4.2

Table 4 shows 151 graduates (91.5 percent) received their teaching certificate at the time of graduation. Within one year of graduation, an additional 4 graduates (2.4 percent) had received their certificate, and within two years one graduate (0.6 percent) had also received a certificate. Within four years, 2 additional graduates (1.2 percent) had received their certificates.

Seven graduates (4.2 percent) indicated they had never received a certificate. The year 1970 has the highest percentage of graduates who have never received a certificate. Four graduates (15.4 percent) of that year never received a teaching certificate.

The year 1973 had the highest percentage of graduates who received their certificate at graduation with 26 graduates, or 96.3 percent.

The year 1976 had the lowest percentage of graduates who received their certificate at graduation with 13 graduates, or 81.3 percent.

Table 4. Time the graduates received their teaching certificates

Year of Graduation	Time Certificate Was Received									
	At Graduation		Within One Year		Within Two Years		Within Four Years		Never	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1969	16	94.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0
1970	22	84.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	15.4
1971	20	95.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
1972	19	95.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
1973	26	96.3	0	0.0	0	0.0.	1	3.7	0	0.0
1974	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1975	18	90.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1976	13	81.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	6.3
TOTALS	151	91.5	4	2.4	1	.6	2	1.2	7	4.2

Table 5 indicates the year the graduates entered the teaching profession. The largest number of graduates entered the teaching profession in 1976; including two graduates of the year 1973, five graduates of the year 1975, and ten graduates of the year 1976 for a total of 17 graduates. One hundred graduates (60.6 percent) indicated they had entered this profession at some point in time.

Table 6 indicates the teaching experience of the graduates. One year of experience was indicated by 33 of the graduates (20 percent). Sixty-six graduates (40 percent) indicated they had no teaching experience. Three graduates, (1.8 percent) indicated they had teaching experience before graduation.

Table 5. The year the graduates entered the teaching profession

Year of Graduation		Year Graduates Entered Teaching							Not
	Percent	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Applicable
1969	No.	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
	Percent	52.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.4
1970	No.	0	11	1	1	1	0	1	0	11
	Percent	0.0	42.3	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	42.3
1971	No.	0	0	8	2	0	1	0	0	10
	Percent	0.0	0.0	38.1	9.5	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	47.6
1972	No.	0	0	0	11	0	1	0	0	8
	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
1973	No.	0	0	0	0	11	4	0	2	10
	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.7	14.8	0.0	7.4	37.0
1974	No.	0	0	0	0	1	8	1	0	8
	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	44.4	5.6	0.0	44.4
1975	No.	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	5	8
	Percent	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	25.0	40.0
1976	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	5
	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	62.5	31.3
TOTAL	No.	9	13	10	14	14	14	9	17	65
	Percent	5.5	7.9	6.1	8.5	8.5	8.5	5.5	10.3	39.4

Table 6. The number of years graduates have taught

Year of Graduation	Years of Teaching Experience							
Percent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	None
1969 No.	2	0	1	2	0	2	3	7
Percent	11.8	0.0	5.9	11.8	0.0	11.8	17.6	41.1
1970 No.	7	4	3	0	1	0	3	8
Percent	26.9	15.4	11.5	0.0	3.8	0.0	11.5	30.8
1971 No.	2	1	2	1	0	4	0	11
Percent	9.5	4.8	9.5	4.8	0.0	19.0	0.0	52.4
1972 No.	2	1	1	2	5	0	0	9
Percent	10.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	45.0
1973 No.	4	0	7	5	0	0	0	11
Percent	14.8	0.0	25.9	18.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.7
1974 No.	1	3	5	1	0	0	0	8
Percent	5.6	16.7	27.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.5
1975 No.	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Percent	30.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0
1976 No.	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Percent	56.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.3
TOTAL No.	33	18	19	11	6	6	6	66
Percent	20.0	10.9	11.5	6.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	40.0

Table 7 shows that 46 graduates (27.9 percent) have had some kind of experience with substitute teaching. The majority of the respondents, 116 graduates (70.3 percent), indicated that they did not have substitute teaching experience.

The 1973 graduates had more substitute teaching experience than did the graduates of other years. Eleven graduates (40.7 percent) indicated they had this experience. The 1972 graduates had the least amount of substitute teaching experience, with only 3 graduates, or 15 percent indicating experience in this area.

Table 7. Graduates who have substitute taught

Year of Graduation	Substitute Teaching Experience					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%
1969	5	29.4	11	64.7	1	5.9
1970	7	26.9	19	73.1	0	0.0
1971	4	19.0	17	81.0	0	0.0
1972	3	15.0	17	85.0	0	0.0
1973	11	40.7	16	59.3	0	0.0
1974	4	22.2	14	77.8	0	0.0
1975	7	35.0	11	55.0	2	10.0
1976	5	31.3	11	68.8	0	0.0
TOTALS	46	27.9	116	70.3	3	1.8

substitute teaching experience, with only 3 graduates, or 15 perecnt indicating experience in this area.

As shown in Table 8, 55 graduates, or 33.3 percent, have taught in areas other than business. Eighty graduates, or 48.5 percent have not taught in other areas. The highest percentage of graduates indicating teaching in other areas was 43.8 percent indicated by the 1976 graduates.

There were 78 respondents to the question dealing with the graduates average teaching load. In reply to this, a total of 308 classes were listed, as shown by Table 9.

The five classes most often taught are as follows: (1) typewriting, (2) shorthand, (3) accounting, (4) office practice, and (5) business machines. Cooperative Education was the class least often taught.

Table 8. Graduates who have taught in areas other than business

Year of Graduation	Teaching Experience in Areas Other Than Business					
	Yes		No		No Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1969	7	41.2	6	35.3	4	23.5
1970	4	15.4	19	73.1	3	11.5
1971	8	38.1	9	42.9	4	19.0
1972	7	35.0	11	55.0	2	10.0
1973	9	33.3	15	55.6	3	11.1
1974	5	27.8	7	38.9	6	33.3
1975	8	40.0	8	40.0	4	20.0
1976	7	43.8	5	31.3	4	25.0
TOTALS	55	33.3	80	48.5	30	18.2

Table 9. Listing of classes taught in average teacher class loads

Class	Responses	
	Number	Percent
Typewriting	81	26.3
Shorthand	66	21.4
Accounting	38	12.3
Office Practice	34	11.0
Business Machines	24	7.8
General Business	15	4.9
Business Law	11	3.6
Business English/Correspondence	9	2.9
Business Math	7	2.3
Record Keeping	5	1.6
Notehand	4	1.3
Personal Finance	4	1.3
Economic Education	4	1.3
Filing	3	1.0
Word Processing	2	0.6
Cooperative Education	1	0.3
TOTAL	308	99.0

Table 10 reveals the related occupations of graduates, and the length of employment in the occupation. Graduates were employed in each area listed with the exception of accounting records machine operator.

The greatest number of graduates reported being employed in the secretarial field. Eighty-seven graduates were employed in this area. The next largest number of graduates reported stenography as their field of labor. Billing machine operator, and teller positions had the least number of graduates.

The trend in the number of graduates employed in an occupation decreased from 109 in the one year or less category to one graduate in the seven years category. The only graduate having worked for seven years is employed in the secretarial field.

Education

The questions on the questionnaire dealing with the graduates education were to ascertain the present educational status of the graduate, and the future plans of the graduate in this area.

Table 11 shows the number and percent of graduates planning to continue their graduate studies. Thirty-four graduates (20.6 percent) plan to continue with graduate studies, while 53 graduates (32.1 percent) do not plan to continue. Sixty-six graduates (40 percent) are uncertain as to whether or not they will continue with their formal education.

The highest percentage of respondents indicating plans for further graduate work were the graduates of 1975. Eight graduates, or 40 percent plan to work toward an advanced degree.

The year 1970 had the highest number of graduates indicating they would not seek an advanced degree with 11 graduates so indicating.

Table 10. Number of graduates and length of time of employment in related occupations

Occupation	Number of Years							
	1 year or less	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years	Five Years	Six Years	Seven Years	Total
Secretary	43	20	13	5	3	2	1	87
Stenographer	9	7	4	0	1	1	0	22
Typist	12	5	3	0	0	0	0	20
File Clerk	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	13
Bookkeeper	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	13
Sales Occupations	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	11
Personnel & Training Mgt.	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	9
Cashier	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Correspondence Clerk	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Misc. Office Machine Operator	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	6
Purchasing Management	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Duplicating Machine Operator	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Computor Operator	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4

Table 10. Continued

Occupation	Number of Years							
	1 Year or less	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years	Five Years	Six Years	Seven Years	Total
Automatic Data Processing Equipment Operator	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Public Relations Management	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Computing & Accounting Recorder	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Billing Machine Operator	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Teller	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Accounting Records Machine Operator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	6	2	5	3	2	1	0	19
TOTALS	109	56	49	14	6	4	1	237

Table 11. Number and percent of graduates planning to continue with graduate studies

Year of Graduation	No Response		Further Graduate Studies							
			Yes		No		Undecided		Completed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1969	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	29.4	9	52.9	3	17.6
1970	0	0.0	4	15.4	11	42.3	8	30.8	3	11.5
1971	1	4.8	3	14.3	7	33.3	8	38.1	2	9.5
1972	0	0.0	5	25.0	8	40.0	7	35.0	0	0.0
1973	0	0.0	7	25.9	10	37.0	10	37.0	0	0.0
1974	0	0.0	5	27.8	3	16.7	9	50.0	1	5.6
1975	1	5.0	8	40.0	3	15.0	7	35.0	1	5.0
1976	0	0.0	2	12.5	6	37.5	8	50.0	0	0.0
TOTALS	2	1.2	34	20.6	53	32.1	66	40.0	10	6.1

Table 11 also indicates the number of graduates who have already finished an advanced degree. Ten graduates, or 6.1 percent have completed graduate degrees. The year with the highest percentage of graduates completing advanced degrees is 1969 with 17.6 percent or 3 graduates who have completed degrees.

Table 12 indicates the degree that would be sought if a graduate completes a degree, and the degree obtained by the graduates who have completed their degree. No graduates have received the M.A., M.B.A., Ed.D., or Ph.D. degrees. The M. S. degree leads the list of degrees received with 91.7 percent of the graduates receiving this degree.

Table 12. Graduates who have earned advanced degrees, and graduates who plan to seek advanced degrees

Degree	Degree Received		Degree Sought	
	No.	%	No.	%
M.S.	11	91.7	41	41.0
M.A.	0	0.0	3	3.0
M.B.A.	0	0.0	10	10.0
M.E.	1	8.3	4	4.0
Ed.D.	0	0.0	1	1.0
Ph.D	0	0.0	2	2.0
Other	-	---	2	2.0
Undecided	-	---	4	4.0
No Response	-	---	35	35.0
TOTALS	12	100.0	100	100.0

The M.S. degree also leads the list of degrees sought with 41 percent of the graduates seeking this degree. None of the graduates currently plan to seek the Ph.D.

Table 13 indicates the field in which the graduate has received his degree, or in which he will seek his degree. Business Education was indicated by the largest number of graduates in both categories--75 percent "received" and 32 percent "sought".

The field of Distributive Education was indicated by the least number of graduates as the field in which they would seek their advanced degree.

Table 13. The field graduates have earned their advanced degrees in, or the field in which they will seek their advanced degree

Field	Field of Degree Earned		Field of Degree Sought	
	No.	%	No.	%
Business Education	9	75.0	32	32.0
Business Administration	0	0.0	14	14.0
Distributive Education	3	25.0	1	1.0
Other	0	0.0	9	9.0
Undecided	-	---	11	11.0
No Response	-	---	33	33.0
TOTALS	12	100.0	100	100.0

Program Evaluations

In the final section of the questionnaire the graduates were asked to indicate the value they placed on each course they took as part of their undergraduate program. In the tables that follow, non-responses, and responses indicating "did not take", were subtracted from the total of 165 respondents and percentages were derived from the responses only.

The tables indicate graduates' responses by grouping the upper two categories (extremely beneficial and very beneficial), the average category, and the lower two categories (little benefit and no benefit). The two categories "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" were grouped because they were both considered positive. "Little benefit" and "no benefit" were grouped because they were both considered negative.

Secretarial training courses

Table 14 shows the degree of value placed on secretarial training courses by the graduates. Beginning typewriting was indicated as the course which was more positive than other courses. The course was rated "extremely benficial" and "very beneficial" by 80.0 percent of the graduates (88 responses). This course also had the lowest percentage of graduates indicating negative categories. Only 3.7 percent of the graduates (4 response) indicated the class was of "little benefit" or "no benefit".

Classes with the highest percentages of graduates indicating "extremely beneficial: and "very beneficial" were: (1) beginning typing, 80.9 percent or 88 responses; (2) intermediate typewriting, 80.1 percent or 109 responses; (3) advanced typewriting, 77.9 percent or 116 responses;

Table 14. The degree of value placed on secretarial training courses

Course	Graduates Responding														Total Response
	Extremely Beneficial		Very Beneficial		Total		Average Benefit		Little Benefit		No Benefit		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Beginning Typewriting	66	60.6	22	20.2	88	80.8	17	15.6	3	2.8	1	.9	4	3.7	109
Inter. Typewriting	72	52.9	37	27.2	109	80.1	20	14.7	5	3.7	2	1.5	7	5.2	136
Advanced Typewriting	74	49.7	42	28.2	116	77.9	25	16.8	7	4.7	1	.7	8	5.4	149
Dict. & Transcription	63	48.8	36	27.9	99	76.7	18	14.0	8	6.2	4	3.1	12	9.3	129
Shorthand II	62	53.0	25	21.4	87	74.4	17	14.5	9	7.7	4	3.4	13	11.1	117
Shorthand III	59	48.0	31	25.2	90	73.2	21	17.1	9	7.3	3	2.4	12	9.7	123
Shorthand I	61	54.5	20	17.9	81	72.4	19	17.0	9	8.0	3	2.7	12	10.7	112
Office Practice	36	24.0	49	32.7	85	56.7	43	28.7	19	12.7	3	2.0	21	14.7	150
Business Machines	29	19.2	51	33.8	80	53.0	47	31.1	20	13.2	4	2.6	24	15.8	151
Secretarial Procedures	39	27.7	33	23.4	72	51.1	42	29.8	20	14.2	7	5.0	27	19.2	141
Office Management	33	23.7	29	20.9	62	44.6	48	34.5	24	17.3	5	3.6	29	20.9	139
Office Data Systems	17	12.6	32	23.7	49	36.3	54	40.0	27	20.0	5	3.7	32	23.7	135

(4) dictation and transcription; 76.9 percent or 99 responses; (5) shorthand II, 74.4 percent or 88 responses; (6) shorthand III, 73.2 percent or 90 responses; and (7) shorthand I, 72.4 percent or 81 responses.

Office Data Systems had the lowest percentage of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" ratings with only 36.3 percent or 49 responses indicating these categories. This course also has the highest percentage of graduates marking "little benefit" or "no benefit" with 23.7 percent (32 responses) of the graduates selecting these two categories.

Business education courses

Table 15 reveals the degree of value graduates placed on business education courses. Methods of teaching typewriting and methods of teaching shorthand show the highest percentages of graduates indicating the upper categories (extremely beneficial and very beneficial). Methods of teaching typewriting has 113 responses (74.4 percent of the graduates) in these categories, while methods of teaching shorthand has 91 responses (66.4 percent of the graduates).

Methods of teaching cooperative education and principles of business education received the lowest rating by the graduates. Methods of teaching cooperative education had 40 responses (32.8 percent of the graduates) in the little benefit and no benefit category, while principles of business education had 54 responses (36.5 percent of the graduates) in these categories.

Principles of business education was the only course where more graduates felt the course was negative than felt the course was positive. This course was, however, discontinued in 1973; the course field based problems is now required.

Table 15. The degree of value placed on business education courses

Course	Graduates Responding														Total Response
	Extremely Beneficial		Very Beneficial		Total		Average Benefit		Little Benefit		No Benefit		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Methods of Teaching Typewriting	70	46.1	43	28.3	113	74.4	19	12.5	13	8.5	7	4.6	20	13.1	152
Methods of Teaching Shorthand	57	41.6	34	24.8	91	66.4	28	20.4	12	8.8	6	4.4	18	13.2	137
Business Communications	37	24.3	46	30.3	83	54.6	49	32.2	16	10.5	4	2.6	20	13.1	152
Managing Personal Finances	33	23.9	41	29.7	74	53.6	42	30.4	17	12.3	5	3.6	22	15.9	138
Simulation Methods	21	23.3	23	25.6	44	48.9	24	26.7	16	17.8	6	6.7	22	24.5	90
Methods of Teaching Basic Business	31	21.7	34	23.8	65	45.5	37	25.9	30	21.0	11	7.7	41	28.7	143
Methods of Teaching Coop. Education	25	20.5	22	18.0	47	38.5	35	28.7	28	23.0	12	9.8	40	32.8	122
Principles of Business Education	15	10.1	25	16.9	40	27.0	54	36.5	30	20.3	24	16.2	54	36.5	148

Business administration courses

Table 16 shows the degree of value placed on business administration courses by the graduates. Personnel administration was the course with the highest percent of graduates indicating the positive categories. The course was rated "extremely beneficial: and "very beneficial" by 37.8 percent of the graduates. The title of this course was changed in 1972 to behavioral dimensions of management. Course content remained the same.*

Corporation finance had the highest percent of graduates indicating the lower categories. Over 50 percent of the graduates (54.6 percent or 42 responses) indicated this course was of "little benefit" or "no benefit" to them.

In six of the business administration courses more graduates indicated the "little" and "no" benefit categories than indicated the "extremely" or "very" beneficial categories. These courses are: (1) behavioral dimensions of management, 28.8 percent positive responses and 37.6 percent negative responses; (2) management concepts, 24.7 percent positive responses and 34.3 percent negative responses; (3) fundamentals of marketing, 21.3 percent positive responses and 39.0 percent negative responses; (4) financial institutions, 19.6 percent positive responses and 37.0 percent negative responses; (5) business statistics, 14.1 percent positive responses and 48.4 percent negative responses; and (6) corporation finance, 11.7 percent positive responses and 54.6 percent negative responses.

---

*Due to the title change of personnel administration to behavioral dimensions of anagement some of the graduates were mistaken as to the identity of the class and marked as having taken both classes. As only 14 graduates (.08 percent) made this error, data was reported as found.

Table 16. The degree of value placed on business administration courses

Course	Graduates Responding														Total Response
	Extremely Beneficial		Very Beneficial		Total		Average Benefit		Little Benefit		No Benefit		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Personnel Administration	16	15.5	23	22.3	39	37.8	38	36.9	17	16.5	9	8.7	26	25.2	103
Business Law I	21	13.7	27	17.6	48	31.3	71	46.4	26	17.0	8	5.2	34	21.5	153
Behavioral Dimensions of Management	10	12.5	13	16.3	23	28.8	27	33.8	21	26.3	9	11.3	30	37.6	80
Business Law II	17	12.2	23	16.5	23	28.8	69	49.6	23	16.5	7	5.0	30	21.5	139
Business Law III	16	13.8	15	12.9	31	26.7	59	50.9	21	18.1	5	4.3	26	22.4	116
Management Concepts	6	5.7	20	19.0	26	24.7	43	41.0	24	22.9	12	11.4	36	34.3	105
Fund. of Marketing	8	5.7	22	15.6	30	21.3	56	39.7	41	29.1	14	9.9	55	39.0	141
Financial Institutions	1	2.2	8	17.4	9	19.6	20	43.5	12	26.1	5	10.9	17	37.0	46
Business Statistics	3	4.7	6	9.4	9	14.1	24	37.5	18	28.1	13	20.3	31	48.4	64
Corporation Finance	1	1.3	8	10.4	9	11.7	26	33.8	24	31.2	18	23.4	42	54.6	77

Professional education courses

Table 17 indicates the degree of value the graduates placed on the professional education courses they took.

Student teaching was rated far above other professional education courses with 76.9 percent of the graduates indicating the upper categories. The class that came closest to this percentage was field based experience with 43.1 percent of the graduates indicating "extremely" and "very" beneficial.

Educational statistics had the lowest percentage of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" rating. Only 13.8 percent of the graduates indicated these categories. This course also had 56.3 percent of the graduates indicate it was of "little" or "no" benefit to them.

In eight of the eleven professional education courses listed, more graduates indicated the "little" and "no" benefit categories than indicated the "extremely" or "very" beneficial categories. These courses are: (1) post student teaching seminar, 36.9 percent positive responses and 40.0 percent negative responses; (2) field based problems, 31.1 percent positive and 40.0 percent negative; (3) school health for secondary teachers, 26.7 percent positive and 27.6 percent negative; (4) improvement of reading, 25.7 percent positive and 34.3 percent negative; (5) educational psychology, 22.2 percent positive and 41 percent negative; (6) principals of secondary education, 18.7 percent positive and 41 percent negative; (7) foundation studies in education, 16.9 percent positive and 46.1 percent negative; and (8) educational statistics, 13.8 percent positive and 56.3 percent negative.

Miscellaneous courses

Table 18 reveals the degree of value graduates placed on the miscellaneous courses they were required to take.

Table 17. The degree of value placed on professional education courses

Course	Graduates Responding														Total Response
	Extremely Beneficial		Very Beneficial		Total		Average Benefit		Little Benefit		No Benefit		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Student Teaching	87	57.2	30	19.7	117	76.9	13	8.6	19	12.5	3	2.0	22	14.5	152
Field Based Experience	10	19.6	12	23.5	22	43.1	12	23.5	13	25.5	4	7.8	17	33.3	51
Post Student Teaching Seminar	8	12.3	16	24.6	24	36.9	15	23.1	18	27.7	8	12.3	26	40.0	65
Student Teaching Seminar	26	17.2	29	19.2	55	36.4	49	32.5	30	19.9	17	11.3	47	31.2	151
Field Based Problems	9	20.0	5	11.1	14	31.1	13	28.9	15	33.3	3	6.7	18	40.0	45
School Health for Secondary Teachers	3	2.8	26	23.9	29	26.7	50	45.9	21	19.3	9	8.3	30	27.6	109
Improvement of Reading	2	5.7	7	20.0	9	25.7	14	40.0	10	28.6	2	5.7	12	34.3	35
Educational Psychology	10	6.9	22	15.3	32	22.2	53	36.8	36	25.0	23	16.0	59	41.0	144
Principles of Secondary Education	6	4.5	19	14.2	25	18.7	54	40.3	37	27.6	18	13.4	55	41.0	134
Foundation Studies	3	3.4	12	13.4	15	16.9	33	37.1	28	31.5	13	14.6	41	46.1	89
Educational Statistics	4	4.6	8	9.2	12	13.8	26	29.9	34	39.1	15	17.2	49	56.3	87

Accounting I, accounting II, and economics I were the only courses in this area that had more graduates responding "extremely and very" beneficial than "little or no" benefit.

Accounting I was the course with the highest percentage of graduates indicating the upper categories. The course was rated "extremely beneficial" and " very beneficial" by 30.7 percent of the respondents.

The courses with more graduates indicating "little or no" benefit than indicating "extremely and very" beneficial are: (1) programming business problems, 34.4 percent positive responses and 36.9 percent negative responses; (2) economics II, 30.4 percent positive and 31.1 percent negative; and (3) introduction to computer science, 28.4 percent positive and 43.3 percent negative.

Individual Course Evaluations and Occupations

The purpose of this section is to show the degree of value graduates placed on each course by the occupation of the graduate. A Chi Square (X^2) was applied to each course to test the hypothesis that the graduates' response was independent from his occupation. In all but five cases, the hypothesis was accepted. It was found that the graduates occupations were not related to their response.

The five courses in which the null hypothesis was rejected were Methods of teaching typewriting, methods of teaching shorthand, economics I, office practice, and office management.

In the following tables the responses for each course are broken down by the graduates occupation. Non-responses and responses indicating "did not take" were subtracted from the total of 165 graduates responding,

Table 18. The degree of value placed on miscellaneous courses

Course	Graduates Responding														Total Response
	Extremely Beneficial		Very Beneficial		Total		Average Benefit		Little Benefit		No Benefit		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Accounting I	38	24.9	47	30.7	85	55.6	48	31.4	17	11.1	3	2.0	20	13.0	153
Accounting II	36	23.7	43	28.3	79	52.0	45	29.6	23	15.1	5	3.3	28	18.4	152
Programming Business Problems	5	13.2	8	21.1	13	34.3	11	29.0	8	21.1	6	15.8	14	36.9	38
Economics I	11	7.2	41	27.0	52	34.2	57	37.5	29	19.1	14	9.2	43	28.3	152
Economics II	11	7.4	34	23.0	45	30.4	57	38.5	29	19.6	17	11.5	46	31.1	148
Introduction to Computer Science	14	10.0	26	18.4	40	28.4	40	28.4	38	27.0	23	16.3	61	43.3	141

and percentages were derived from the responses only. The total number of responses for each occupation are listed.

The tables show graduates' responses by grouping the upper categories (extremely beneficial and very beneficial), the average category, and grouping the lower two categories (little benefit and no benefit). The two categories "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" were grouped because they were both considered positive. "Little benefit" and "no benefit" were grouped because they were both considered negative.

The data for the narrative for secretarial courses, business education courses, business administration courses, professional education courses and miscellaneous courses the graduate was required to take appears in the Appendix.

Secretarial courses

Beginning Typewriting. Table 19 (Appendix, page 108) shows the occupation of the graduate, and the degree of value graduates place on the course beginning typewriting.

Graduates giving no response as to their occupation rated the course higher than did graduates giving a response as to their occupation. One hundred percent of the graduates giving no occupation found the course to be "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance is .117, so the null hypothesis is accepted.

Intermediate Typewriting. Table 20 (Appendix, page 108) shows the occupation of the graduate and the degree of value graduates place on the course intermediate typewriting.

Again, graduates giving no response as their occupation rated the course higher than did graduates giving a response as to their occupation. One hundred percent of the graduates giving no occupation found the course to be "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance is .245, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Advanced Typewriting. Table 21 (Appendix, page 109) shows the occupation of the graduate, and the degree of value graduates place on the course advanced typewriting.

Graduates giving no response as to their occupation, and graduates in the "other" occupations category rated this course higher than the other occupational areas. Over eighty-five percent of these graduates (87.5 percent) indicated advanced typewriting was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .607, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Shorthand I. Table 22 (Appendix, page 109) shows the occupation of the graduate, and the degree of value graduates place on the course shorthand I.

Graduates giving no response as to their occupation indicated that this course was of more value to them than did the graduates listing occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" by 83.3 percent of the graduates giving no response as to their occupation.

The calculated chi square level of significance for shorthand I was .418, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Shorthand II. Table 23 (Appendix, page 110) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value graduates place on the course shorthand II.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. Over 85 percent (86.7 percent) of the graduates in two or more occupations rated the course "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .660, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Shorthand III. Table 24 (Appendix, page 110) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value graduates place on the course shorthand III.

Again, graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" by 85.7 percent of the graduates in two or more occupations.

The calculated chi square level of significance for shorthand III was .553, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Dictation and Transcription. Table 25 (Appendix, page 111) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value graduates place on the course dictation and transcription.

Graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation had the highest percentage of graduates indicating the upper categories with 83.3 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance was .608, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Secretarial Procedures. Table 26 (Appendix, page 111) shows the graduates occupations, and the value graduates placed on the course secretarial procedures.

The graduates in business had the highest percentage (64.3 percent) of responses in the "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" categories. The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .078, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Office Data Systems. Table 27 (Appendix, page 112) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the value placed on the course office data systems by the graduates.

Again, the graduates in business had the highest percentage of responses in the "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" categories. Fifty percent of these graduates indicated the upper categories.

The calculated chi square level of significance for Office Data Systems was .739, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business Machines. Table 28 (Appendix page 112) shows the graduate's occupations, and the value placed on business machines by the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. Over sixty percent (64.7 percent) of the graduates in two or more occupations rated the course "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .687, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Office Practice. Table 29 (Appendix, page 113) shows the graduates occupations, and the value placed on this course by the graduates.

Graduates giving no response as to their occupation indicated that this course was of more value to them than did the graduates listing occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" by 75.0 percent of the graduates giving no response as to their occupation.

Office practice was one of five classes that rejected the null hypothesis that the graduates occupation was not related to the graduates response when the Chi Square (X^2) test was applied. The calculated chi square level of significance is .042, so the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Office Management. Table 30 (Appendix, page 113) shows the graduate's occupations, and the value placed on this course by the graduates.

Again, graduates giving no response as to their occupation indicated that this course was of more value to them than did the graduates listing occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" by 71.4 percent of the graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation.

Office management was the second of the five cases in which the null hypothesis was rejected. The calculated chi square level of significance is .032, so the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Business education courses

Managing Personal Finances. Table 31 (Appendix, page 114) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value graduates place on the course managing personal finances.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. Over 75 percent (77.8 percent) of the graduates in two or more occupations rated the course "extremely beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance was .496, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business Communications. Table 32 (Appendix, page 114) shows the occupations of the graduates and the degree of value graduates place on the course business communications. Again, graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" by 66.7 percent of the graduates in two or more occupations.

The calculated chi square level of significance was .666, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Graduates who gave no response as to their occupation at the present time rated the course lowest, with only 44.4 percent of the graduates indicating the positive categories and 22.2 percent indicating the negative categories.

Principles of Business Education. Table 33 (Appendix, page 115) shows the graduate's occupations, and the value graduates place on the course principles of business education.

"Other" occupations had the highest percentage of graduates indicating "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" with only 35.0 percent indicating these categories.

The graduates in business had the highest percentage (46.2 percent) of responses in the categories "little benefit" and "no benefit". In all categories of occupations but one (two or more occupations) the

percentage in the lower categories of little and no benefit exceed the percentage in the higher categories of extremely beneficial and very beneficial.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .266, so the null hypothesis is accepted.

Methods of Teaching Basic Business. Table 34 (Appendix, page 115) shows the current occupation of the graduate, and the value the graduate placed on the course methods of teaching basic business.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 62.5 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial".

Graduates in "other" occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories with 35.1 percent indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for methods of teaching basic business was .655, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Methods of Teaching Typewriting. Table 35 (Appendix, page 116) reveals the occupation of the graduates, and the value graduates placed on the course methods of teaching typewriting.

Graduates in the teaching profession rated the course far above the graduates in other listed occupations. This course was rated by 90.9 percent of the teachers as "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Methods of teaching typewriting was one of five cases that rejected the null hypothesis that the graduates occupation was not related to the graduates response when the Chi Square (X^2) test was applied. The chi square level of significance is .0001, so the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Methods of Teaching Cooperative Education. Table 36 (Appendix 116) shows the graduates' occupations, and the value the graduates place on the course methods of teaching cooperative education.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the class higher than did graduates in single occupations. The course was rated in the upper categories by 85.7 percent of these graduates.

Graduates in business had the highest percentage of responses in the negative categories with 52.4 percent of the graduates indicating "little or no" benefit.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .188, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Methods of Teaching Shorthand. Table 37 (Appendix, page 117) reports the value graduates placed on the course methods of teaching shorthand, and the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the positive categories, with 83.3 percent of the graduates indicating "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Methods of teaching shorthand was the fourth of five cases that rejected the null hypothesis that the graduates occupations were not related to the graduates' responses when the Chi Square (X^2) test was applied. The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .034, so the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Simulation Methods. Table 38 (Appendix, page 117) shows the value graduates placed on the course simulation methods by the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation had the highest percentage of graduates indicating the positive categories with 66.7 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Graduates in business had the highest percentage of responses in the negative categories with 47.4 percent of the graduates indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for simulation methods was .261, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business administration course

Business Law. Table 39 (Appendix, page 118) reveals the value graduates placed on the beginning course in business law by the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the class higher than did graduates in single occupations. The course was rated in the upper categories by 66.7 percent of these graduates.

Graduates in the "other" occupation category had the highest percent of responses in the negative categories with 26.2 percent of the graduates indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .862, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business Law II. Table 40 (Appendix page 118) reports the value graduates placed on the course business law II by the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories, with 57.1 percent of the graduates

indicating "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial". Graduates in the other occupation category had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories, with 25.6 percent of the graduates indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for business law II was .862, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business Law III. Table 41 (Appendix, page 119) reports the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value the graduates placed on the course business law III.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses marked "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial", with 66.7 percent of the graduates indicating these categories.

Graduates in the "other" occupation category had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories with 26.5 percent of the graduates indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .718, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Fundamentals of Marketing. Table 42 (Appendix, page 119) shows the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value the graduates placed on the course fundamentals of marketing.

For this course, the graduates employed in two or more occupations showed the highest percentage (33.3 percent) in the upper categories of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial". The graduates who did not respond when asked their present occupation showed the highest percentage (41.1 percent) in the low categories of "little benefit" and "no benefit."

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .708, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Business Statistics. Table 43 (Appendix, page 120) indicates the degree of value the graduates placed on the course business statistics, and the occupation of the graduates.

The graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of graduates indicating business statistics was "extremely beneficial: or "very beneficial". Even so, only 33.3 percent of the graduates indicated these categories.

In all occupations, the negative column percentage (little benefit or no benefit) exceeded the positive column percentage (extremely beneficial and very beneficial). In two occupational areas, the lower column percentages were 50 percent or over. These were: (1) two or more occupations, 50.0 percent; and (2) no response for occupation, 75.0 percent.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .425, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Management Concepts. Table 44 (Appendix, page 120) reports the value the graduates placed on the course management concepts and the graduates' occupations.

Graduates employed in two or more occupations rated this course higher than the graduates in single occupations. Management concepts was rated "extremely beneficial" or "very beneificial" by 42.9 percent of these graduates.

Percentages of graduates in teaching, "other" occupations, and giving no response as to their present occupation were greater in the negative categories than in the positive categories.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .524, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Corporation Finance. Table 45 (Appendix, page 121) shows the value graduates placed on the course corporation finance, and the occupations of the graduates.

Again, graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did graduates in single occupations. This course was rated "extremely beneficial" and very beneficial" by 33.3 percent of the graduates in two or more occupations.

Graduates in two or more occupations also had the highest percentage of responses in the negative categories with 66.7 percent indicating the course was of "little benefit" or "no benefit".

In all occupations, the lower column percentage (little benefit or no benefit) exceeded the upper column percentages (extremely beneficial and very beneficial). In three occupational areas, the lower column percentages were over 50 percent. These three areas were: (1) teaching, 59.4 percent; (2) "other occupations", 55.0 percent; and (3) two or more occupations, 66.7 percent.

The calculated chi square level of significance for corporation finance was .163 so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Financial Institutions. Table 46 (Appendix, page 121) reports the value graduates placed on the course financial institutions and the occupation of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 66.7 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial".

Graduates in business had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories with 55.6 percent indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

In three of the occupations, the lower column percentage (little benefit and no benefit) exceeded the upper column percentages (extremely beneficial and very beneficial). These occupations are teaching, business, and "other" occupations.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .413, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Behavioral Dimensions of Management. In Table 47 (Appendix, page 122) the value the graduates placed on the course behavioral dimensions of management and the occupations of the graduates are reported.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 50.0 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial".

Graduates in the teaching profession had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories with 42.9 percent indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The chi square level of significance for behavioral dimensions of managment was .594, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Personnel Administration. Table 48 (Appendix, page 122) shows the value graduates placed on the course personnel administration and the graduates' occupations.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 71.4 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial". Graduates in the "other occupation" category had the highest percentage of responses in the lower categories with 30.3 percent indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit". The chi square level of significance for this course was .410, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Professional education courses

Educational Statistics. Table 49 (Appendix, page 123) shows the value graduates placed on the course educational statistics and the graduates' occupations.

For this course, the graduates employed in business showed the highest percentage (22.2 percent) in the upper categories of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial".

In all occupations, the negative column percentages (little benefit and no benefit) were 50 percent or above. The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .893, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Educational Psychology. Table 50 (Appendix, page 123) reveals the value the graduates place on the course educational psychology and the graduates occupations.

Graduates in business rated the course higher than graduates in other listed occupations, with 38.5 percent indicating the positive categories. Graduates giving no response as to their present occupation had the highest percentage of responses in the negative categories with 53.3 percent indicating "little benefit" or "no benefit".

In all but one case there was a higher percentage in the negative categories of "little benefit" and "no benefit" than in the positive categories of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial". Graduates employed in business was the exception, with 38.5 percent in the positive categories and 30.8 percent in the negative categories.

The calculated chi square level of significance for educational psychology was .336, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Foundation Studies. Table 51 (Appendix, page 124) reports the occupations of the graduates, and the degree of value the course foundation studies was to the graduates.

Graduates giving no response as to their present occupation rated this course higher than did those in the other listed occupations. Only 40 percent of these graduates, however, indicated the course was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

In all but one case, the percentages under the "little benefit" or "no benefit" column were higher than the percentages under the "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" column. The exception was graduates giving no response for their present occupation with 40.0 percent in the upper categories and 30.0 percent in the lower categories.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .313, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Principles of Secondary Education. Table 52 (Appendix, page 124) shows the value graduates place on the course principles of secondary education and the occupations of the graduates.

In this course graduates giving no response as to their present occupation rated the class higher than did those in the other listed occupations. The percentage was 35.2 in this case. For all occupations the negative category percentages exceeded those of the positive category.

The calculated chi square level of significance was .548, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

School Health for Secondary Teachers. Table 53 (Appendix, page 125) shows the value graduates placed on the course school health for secondary teachers and the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in business found this course to be more beneficial than did the graduates in the other listed occupations, with 30.4 percent indicating the upper categories of "extremely" and "very" beneficial. The chi square level of significance for this course was .944, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Improvement of Reading. Table 54 (Appendix, page 125) reveals the value the graduates placed on the course improvement of reading and the occupation of the graduates.

All of the occupations with the exceptions of two, show a higher percentage in the negative categories than in the positive categories. The exceptions are graduates with two or more occupations and graduates giving no response as to their present occupation.

The calculated chi square level of significance for improvement of reading was .393, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Field Based Experience. Table 55 (Appendix, page 126) reports the value the graduates placed on the course field based experience and the occupations of the graduates. This course was not offered until 1974, so a fewer number of graduates responded to this course evaluation.

Graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation rated this course the highest with 77.8 percent indicating the upper categories. Fifty percent of the graduates indicating "other occupations responded "little benefit" or "no benefit", which was the highest percentage in that column.

The calculated chi square level of significance was .667, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Field Based Problems. Table 56 (Appendix, page 126) shows the value the graduates place on the course field based problems and the

occupation of the graduate. This course was not offered until 1974, so a fewer number of graduates responded to this course evaluation.

Graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation showed the highest percentage in the "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" column with 66.7 percent indicating the upper category.

Graduates in the "other" occupational area rated the class the lowest, with 56.3 percent responding "little benefit" or "no benefit". In all occupations but one, the percentage in the "little benefit" or "no benefit" column was higher than the percentage in the "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" column. The exception was the graduates giving no response as to their occupation.

The calculated chi square level of significance for field based problems was .317, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Student Teaching Seminar. Table 57 (Appendix, page 127) shows the degree of value the graduates placed on the course student teaching seminar and the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates giving no response as to their present occupation had the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 36.8 percent indicating "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Graduates in two or more occupations showed the highest percentage of responses in the "little benefit" or "no benefit" column with 44.4 percent indicating the lower categories.

In all cases, with one exception, the percentages in the "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" column exceed or equal the percentages in the "little benefit" or "no benefit" column. The exception is the percentages for the graduates employed in two or more occupations, with 11.1 percent indicating the upper categories and 44.4 percent the lower.

The calculated chi square level of significance for the course student teaching seminar was .099, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Student Teaching. Table 58 (Appendix, page 127) reveals the value the graduates place on their student teaching experience, and the graduates' occupations.

Graduates in the teaching profession showed the highest percentage of responses in the positive categories with 85.2 percent indicating student teaching was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

This course was rated highly by graduates in all listed occupations, will all percentages in the positive categories over 65 percent. In all cases the percentages in the "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" column far exceeded the percentages in the "little benefit" or "no benefit" column.

The calculated chi square level of significance for student teaching was .134, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Post Student Teaching Seminar. Table 59 (Appendix, page 128) reports the degree of value graduates placed on the course post student teaching seminar.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated the course higher than did the graduates in the other listed occupations, with 66.7 percent of their responses in the "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" column. Graduates in the teaching profession had the highest percentage of responses in the negative categories, with 47.8 percent of the teachers indicating the course was of "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The calculated chi square level of significance for the course post student teaching seminar was .102, so the null hypothesis was rejected.

Miscellaneous courses

Accounting I. Table 60 (Appendix, page 128) reports the value the graduates place on the course accounting I by the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in business have found this course to be more beneficial to them than graduates in the other listed occupations. The upper category of "extremely beneficial" and "very beneficial" had 66.7 percent of these graduates' responses.

In all occupations, the percentages in the upper categories exceeded the percentages in the lower categories. Also, in all cases the percentages in the lower categories of "little benefit" and "no benefit" were under 20 percent.

The calculated chi square level of significance for this course was .391, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Accounting II. Table 61 (Appendix, page 129) shows the value the graduates place on the course accounting II, and the graduates' occupations.

Graduates in two or more occupations had the highest percentage of responses in the positive categories with 66.7 percent indicating this course was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Again, in all occupations, the percentages in the positive categories exceeded the percentages in the negative categories.

The calculated chi level of significance for this course was .418 so the null hypothesis may be accepted.

Economics I. Table 62 (Appendix, page 129) shows the value the graduates place on the course economics I by the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations showed the highest percentage of responses in the positive categories with 55.6 percent indicating this course was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Economics I was the last of five casès in which the null hypothesis was rejected. The calculated chi square level of significance for this course is .0476 so the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Economics II. Table 63 (Appendix, page 130) shows the degree of value graduates placed on the course economics II by the occupation of the graduates.

Graduates in two or more occupations rated this course higher than did graduates in the other listed occupations with 44.4 percent responding "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

Graduates giving no response when asked their present occupation showed the highest percentage in the lower categories, with 52.9 percent indicating the course was of "little benefit" or "no benefit".

The chi square level of significance for economics II was .170, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Introduction to Computer Science. Table 64 (Appendix, page 130) reveals the degree of value gradutes place on the course introduction to computer science and the occupations of the graduates.

Graduates in business found this course to be more beneficial than did the graduates in the other listed occupations. Thirty-six percent of these graduates in business found the course to be "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial"

The calculated chi square level of significance for introduction to computer science was .720, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Programming Business Problems. Table 65 (Appendix, page 132) shows the value graduates placed on the course programming business problems by the graduates' occupations. This course has not been required since 1972, which accounts for the low number of respondents to this course.

Graduates in business showed the highest percentage of responses in the upper categories with 60.0 percent indicating the course was "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial".

The calculated chi square level of significance for programming business problems was .931, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

The final question of the questionnaire was an open-ended question asking the graduates to make any comments concerning the strengths and weaknesses of their undergraduate program at Utah State University.

This section will be a report on the most frequently given comments of the graduates. The major strengths and weaknesses of the program will be discussed first, to be followed by the comments made most often concerning these areas. The strengths and weaknesses will be listed beginning with the one most often mentioned. A section listing specific comments of graduates deemed relevant by the writer of this paper will be included in the Appendix, page 102.

The majority of the graduates indicated they felt the undergraduate program in business education at Utah State University was excellent or good. Some of the reasons given by a number of the graduates for this rating are: (1) the small classes providing individualized attention; (2) the broad exposure the program gives; (3) the innovativeness of the department, and (4) the extension course program offered by the department.

Strengths of the program as seen by the graduates

The major strength of the program as reported most often by the graduates was the faculty. Reasons given by the graduates for this evaluation are: (1) the interest and concern of the faculty for the individual student; (2) the availability and helpfulness of the faculty; (3) the ability of the faculty to work harmoniously with students and other members of the faculty; (4) the expertise of the faculty; (5) the professionalism of the faculty; and (5) the ability of the faculty to motivate the students.

The student teaching program was the next most often reported strength. Graduates felt that practical experience and working with experienced teachers in the field were essential and very helpful. Some suggestions the graduates gave for the improvement of the student teaching program were: (1) better selection of the supervising teacher; (2) more supervision by the university co-ordinator and (3) more interaction between the university co-ordinator and the supervising teachers so the student teacher is not torn between conflicting ideas and methods of teaching.

The Methods of teaching classes were also listed as a major strength of the program. A large number of the graduates felt the reference materials they had received in these classes were very beneficial. Having a number of different methods classes was also seen as a strength.

Some suggestions given by the graduates for improving the methods classes are: (1) teaching typewriter repair; (2) teaching disciplinary measures; and (3) teaching less theory and presenting mroe practical "know-how" for use in the classroom.

Graduates also commented that the secretarial training classes were very beneficial to them, and that the facilities and equipment of the Department of Business Education are excellent.

Weaknesses of the program as seen by the graduates

The major weakness of the business education program as mentioned by the majority of the graduates is the education classes the graduates are required to take. A large number of the graduates felt that the education classes were "a waste of time." Some of the reasons given by a number of the graduates as to why they considered these classes a waste of time were: (1) the classes were unrealistic; (2) the classes were too general to be of help; (3) the classes involved too much theory; and (4) the classes were "out-of-date".

Areas that should be worked on for improvement in the classes, as seen by the graduates are: (1) how to grade; (2) how to handle discipline problems; and (3) how to deal with parents and others with whom the teacher has contact; and (4) how to deal with extra-curricular assignments.

Some of the courses required in Business Administration, and Economics were also perceived by the graduates to be a weakness of the program. Many graduates felt a few of these courses were a "waste of time" and "unnecessary", because they involved knowledge the graduate never used, and that was not for use in a high school classroom. The specific courses most often mentioned by the graduates as fitting into this category were: (1) corporate finance; (2) fundamentals of marketing; and (3) economics.

The last major weakness listed by graduates was a lack of preparation to teach basic business subjects. The graduates felt that their training in this area was too general and that more emphasis should be placed on basic business.

Despite these mentioned weaknesses, the majority of the graduates emphasized that they felt their preparation to teach was good, and that the program in Business Education at Utah State University had been very beneficial.

Summary

The findings from the data as reported on the questionnaires were presented in this chapter. Of 225 questionnaires sent out, 165 useable responses were returned, constituting a 73.3 percent return.

Findings were presented in sections with the following headings: (1) questionnaire replies, (2) employment, (3) education, and (4) program evaluation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to conduct a follow-up survey of the business education graduates who received bachelors' degrees from Utah State University during the years 1969 through 1976.

Specific purposes of the study were:

1. To determine the job classifications related to business in which the graduate has been employed since graduation, and to determine the field in which the graduate is presently employed.

2. To determine how much, and what kind of teaching experience the graduate has had.

3. To determine the future educational plans of the graduate.

4. To determine what the graduate judges to be the strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate business education program.

The data was gathered by a direct-mail survey of the 225 graduates from the years 1969 through 1976. A total of 165 useable questionnaires were returned constituting a 73.3 percent return.

Frequency counts, cross-tabulations and Chi Square (X^2) tests were compiled and computed on the university computer. Percentages and other cross-tabulations were tabulated manually. The findings were presented in Chapter IV.

Summary of Findings

The results of this study are summarized as follows:

1. A total of 165 useable questionnaires were returned out of a possible 225, constituting a 73.3 percent return. Graduates of 1976 had the best percentage of responses--88.9 percent.

2. Thirty graduates, or 18.2 percent, are presently teaching. Forty-six graduates, or 27.9 percent, are employed in business. Ten graduates, or 6.1 percent, are employed in other occupations, and 20 graduates, or 12.1 percent, are employed in two or more occupations.

3. Graduates now holding a teaching certificate number 130, or 78.8 percent. Graduates who do not hold a teaching certificate at the present time, but who have held one in the past number 28, or 17.0 percent. Seven graduates, or 4.2 percent, have never held a teaching certificate.

4. The majority of the graduates (91.5 percent) received their teaching certificate at the time of graduation.

5. One hundred graduates, or 60.6 percent, entered the teaching profession at some point in time. One year of experience was indicated by 33 graduates, or 20 percent.

6. The majority of the graduates, (116 graduates or 70.3 percent) have not had substitute teaching experience. Fifty-five graduates, or 33.3 percent, have taught in areas other than business.

7. The five classes most often taught by the graduates in descending order are: (1) typewriting, (2) shorthand, (3) accounting, (4) office practice, and (5) business machines.

8. The secretarial field retained the greatest number of graduates, 87, with stenography retaining the next largest number of graduates, 22.

9. Thirty-four graduates (20.6 percent) plan further graduate studies while 53 graduates (32.1 percent) do not. Sixty-six graduates (40 percent) are uncertain whether they will continue their formal education. The M.S. degree leads the list of degrees sought with 41 percent of the graduates seeking this degree. Business education was the field in which the largest percentage of graduates will seek their degree (32 percent).

10. Ten graduates (6.1 percent) have completed graduate degrees. The majority of the graduates received the M.S. degree (91.7 percent). Seventy-five percent (9 graduates) received their degrees in the field of Business education.

11. The majority of the classes listed under secretarial training courses were found to be "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" by over 50 percent of the graduates. Classes under this heading that were found to be the most beneficial to the graduates were the typewriting series and the shorthand series. Office data systems was found to be the course of least benefit.

12. The business education course found to be the most beneficial was methods of teaching typewriting, followed by methods of teaching shorthand. Principles of business education was found to be the course of least benefit.

13. Personnel administration was the most beneficial class listed under business administration courses. Corporation finance was listed as the course least beneficial.

14. Student teaching was reported to be the most beneficial professional education course, followed by field based experience. The least beneficial course to the graduates was educational statistics.

15. Of the miscellaneous courses listed, the accounting classes were found to be the most beneficial, and introduction to computer science the least beneficial.

16. When the Chi Square Test (X^2) was applied to test the hypothesis that the graduates' response concerning the degree of value of courses is independent from his occupation, methods of teaching typewriting, methods of teaching shorthand, and economics I were the only courses to reject the hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

17. In many cases graduates in two or more occupations valued their courses higher than did the graduates in all other listed occupations.

18. The majority of the graduates indicated they felt the undergraduate program in business education at Utah State University was excellent or good.

19. The major strengths of the program in descending order are: (1) the faculty; (2) the student teaching program; and (3) the methods of teaching classes.

20. The major weaknesses of the program in descending order are: (1) some of the professional education classes; (2) some of the business administration and economics classes, particularly corporation finance; and (3) a lack of emphasis placed on how to teach basic business subjects.

Conclusions

The findings of this study seem to support the following conclusions:

1. Generally, the more recent the graduation, the higher the percentage of return. This occurrence could be due to the closer ties of the more recent graduates, or to the easier location of the more recent graduates.

2. Only 18.2 percent of the graduates are presently teaching, while 78.8 percent are certified to teach, and 60.6 percent have entered the teaching profession at some time. The disparity might be due to the fact that many of the graduates are female, and leave the teaching profession for reasons relating to their sex, or that they have chosen non-teaching employment.

3. The majority of the graduates (78.8 percent) are presently holding teaching certificates, indicating that perhaps they plan on teaching at some point in time.

4. The majority of the graduates have not substitute taught, or taught in areas other than business.

5. Four of the five classes most often taught (typewriting, shorthand, accounting, office practice, and business machines) are skills classes, indicating that skills classes are in more demand than non-skilled classes.

6. Graduates are employed in a large variety of occupations, indicating that their preparation at Utah State University can be applied in differing occupations.

7. Only 20.6 percent of the graduates definitely plan on receiving an advanced degree, and only 6.1 percent have completed advanced degrees, indicating a need for the Department of Business Education to offer more encouragement and information in this area to undergraduates.

8. The majority of the classes listed under secretarial training courses were found to be "extremely beneficial" or "very beneficial" by over 50 percent of the graduates, indicating that these courses are beneficial to the graduates regardless of their occupations.

9. Courses indicated by the graduates as being the most beneficial were: Methods of teaching typewriting, methods of teaching shorthand, personnel administration, student teaching, and accounting I and II. This could be due to the fact that the course content in these courses is more practical in nature.

10. Courses indicated by the graduates as being the least beneficial were office data systems, principles of business education, corporation finance, educational statistics, and introduction to computer science, which indicates a need for the revision of requirements or course contents.

11. Methods of teaching typewriting, methods of teaching shorthand, economics I, office practice and office management, were the five courses in which the null-hypothesis was rejected using a Chi Square (X^2) test, indicating the value of the course to the graduates depends upon the occupations of the graduates.

12. Graduates who have worked in two or more occupations put a greater value on their course work than those graduates in other listed occupations. This assumption may be incorrect, due to the low number of graduates in two or more occupations. "Unless the number of frequencies is reasonably large, a percentage may be misleading and may seem to suggest a generalization that in unwanted."

13. Members of the Department of Business Education at Utah State University do a good job of preparing their graduates, as seen by the graduates who felt their preparation was "excellent" or "good".

---

[32]Best, Research in Education, p. 214.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made on the basis of the findings and conclusions from this study:

1. The members of the Department of Business Education continue their fine preparation of business education graduates.

2. Future studies similar to the Joyce P. Heisick study and this study be conducted to insure the continued evaluation of the business education program at Utah State University, and to keep the department informed about the activities pursued by students after graduation.

3. These follow-up studies be made at intervals of no more than five years to increase the percentage of return.

4. The Department of Business Education should keep better records as to the graduates' addresses, so that the newsletter prepared by the department will reach the student. This newsletter should keep the graduates informed about current developments in business education, which would encourage graduates to continue their education and to utilize their business education background.

5. Careful selection of the supervising teachers involved with student teachers be made to insure that the experience will not be discouraging to the student, but will be worthwhile.

6. The Department of Business Education should do a better job of informing graduates of the nature and advantages of advanced degrees, and the job opportunities available for graduates with these degrees.

7. The course content or requirements for the following classes be re-evaluated for possible change: Office data systems, principles of business education, corporation finance, educational statistics, and introduction to computer science.

REFERENCE LIST

Anderson, Lynne K. "A Follow-Up Study of the Commercial Division Graduates of Coastal Carolina Community College for the Years 1969 Through 1973." Business Education Forum 31 (October 1976):40.

Best, John W. Research in Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Cofield, Lois S. "An Evaluation Follow-Up Study of Hampton Institute Business Graduates of 1967-1971." Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1964.

Cressy, Charles L. "An Appraisal of the Undergraduate Business Education Programs at Chadron State College Based on a Follow-Up of the Graduates from January, 1965 through May, 1974." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1974.

Grovom, Evelyn L. "An Evaluation of the Business Teacher Education Curricula in Colleges Based on the Opinions of the Business Teachers in the Public High Schools in the State of Minnesota." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968.

Hawkins, Calvin H. "A Follow-Up Study To Determine the Use of Selected Consumer Education Concepts by High School Graduates." Ph.D. thesis, University of Northern Colorado, 1975.

Heisick, Joyce P. "A Follow-up Study of the Utah State University Business Education, Distributive Education, and Office Administration Graduates." Master's thesis, Utah State University, 1969.

Kaisershot, Alfred L. "An Appraisal of the Undergraduate Business Teacher Education Program at the University of Nebraska; A Follow-Up of the Graduates, 1959-69." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1970.

Keppel, Frederick Paul. "The Occupations of College Graduates as Influenced by the Undergraduate Course." Educational Review (December 1910):433-439.

Lewis, Howard T. "The Social Survey in Rural Education." Educational Review (October 1914):273-74.

Lowry, Robert Arnold. "Principles of Follow-Up Research in Business Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.

Pomeroy. E. C. "What's going on in Teacher Education: The View from Washington." Education Digest (January 1976):70

Riggs, R. O. "Life Saving Prescriptions for Schools of Education." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (january 1976):70.

Roberts, Donald Rue. "An Assessment of the Secretarial and Clerical Programs in the Area Vocational-Technical Schools of Arkansas" Ed.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1975.

Ryan, Margaret. "A Follow-up Study of the 1970 through 1974 Graduates of Campbell County High School Who Completed 2 Years of Shorthand." Masters thesis, Morehead State University, 1975.

Shipman, Meada Gibbs. "A Study of the Graduates Who Earned Bachelor Degrees in Business in 1964, 1965, 1969, and 1970 from Four Predominantly Black Universityies." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconson at Madison, 1973.

Talbot, Walter D., and Winger, Lerue. Report to Utah State Board of Education on the Teacher Education Programs at Utah State University. Salt Lake City: Division of Staff Development, 1976.

U.S. Department of Interior. Business Education in Secondary Schools by the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Bulletin No. 55. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1919.

U.S. Department of Interior, Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education by the National Education Association Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Bulletin No. 19. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1918.

Utah State Board for Vocational Education. Vocational Education Management Delivery Guide (Salt Lake City: 1976).

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1969-1970 Catalog. V 69 No. 5. May 1969.

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1970-1971 Catalog. V 70 No. 7. May 1970.

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1971-1973 Catalog. V 71 No. 8. May 1971.

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1972-1974 Catalog. V 74 No. 6. September 1972.

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1974-1976 Catalog. V 74 No. 6. June 1974.

Utah State University. Utah State University Bulletin, 1976-1978 Catalog. V 76 No. 7. July 1976.

Wandmacher, James L. "A Follow-up Study of 1968-1972 Burnsville Senior High School Office Education Graduates with Implications for Curriculum Revisions." Masters thesis, University of Minnesota [Minneapolis] 1974.

Weersing, Frederick J. "A Study of Certain Aspects of Commercial Education in the Public High Schools of Minnesota." Ph. D. dissertation University of Minnesota, 1967.

Wells, Barron Wade. "The Business Teacher Education Curriculum: University of Houston." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1971.

Whitted, Mildred M. "The Relevance of College Experiences: A Survey of Business Student." Business Education World 54 (March 1974):29.

Woodward, C. M. "Presnet Occupations of the Graduates of the St. Louis Manual Training School, October, 1894." Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1893-1894. Vo. 1, Pt. 2, Washington, D.C. United States Government Printing Office, 1896.

Young Shepard. "An Occupational Survey of the Commercial Graduates of Three High Schools of Terre Haute, Indiana." Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1929.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS FOR SURVEY AND QUESTIONNAIRE

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UMC 35, LOGAN, UTAH 84322
Phone (801) 752-4100 Ext. 7988

DEPARTMENT OF
BUSINESS EDUCATION

February 28, 1977

Dear Business Education Graduate:

The world is constantly changing, and innovations are taking place in all aspects of life. Changes in our society should be reflected by changes in the curriculum of a school. You, as an educator, worker, and member of society are in a position to help.

The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to you as part of a study of Business Education graduates from Utah State University during the years 1969 through 1976. The purpose of this follow-up study is to determine the effectiveness of your preparation for employment and to ascertain the value that you, the graduate, place on your undergraduate coursework.

This follow-up study of Utah State graduates can be of value to the department in evaluating the curricular offerings in Business Education. Your assistance in this study would be greatly appreciated. A complete response is needed if it is to be effective, its purpose realized, and the results of significant value.

Please help by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the stamped, addressed envelope provided. All replies will be considered strictly confidential.

Thank you for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Cynthia M. Olsen

Cynthia M. Olsen
Project Coordinator

Ted Ivarie

Ted Ivarie, Head
Department of Business Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UMC 35, LOGAN, UTAH 84322
Phone (801) 752-4100 Ext. 7988

DEPARTMENT OF
BUSINESS EDUCATION

April 18, 1977

Dear Alumnus:

Your assistance is needed! With the changes taking place in society, school curriculums need to be revised continually. The enclosed questionnaire concerning your preparation for employment and the value you place on your undergraduate coursework can be of value to the Department of Business Education at Utah State University in evaluating their curricular offerings.

If you have already mailed the previously sent questionnaire, I thank you for your help in the study. Alumni response has been good so far, but for a valid, effective study a complete response is needed. As you know, questionnaire respondents will remain completely anonymous. I would appreciate it if you would return this questionnaire in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope by May 2.

Your copy of the questionnaire would be a most welcome addition. The results of this study should be valuable to all concerned with business education at Utah State University. Thank you for your consideration of this project.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

Cynthia Olsen Krebs
Business Education Department

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UMC 35, LOGAN, UTAH 84322
Phone (801) 752-4100 Ext. 7988

DEPARTMENT OF
BUSINESS EDUCATION

May 16, 1977

Dear Alumnus:

Please! Your help is urgently needed! It is necessary to have the enclosed questionnaire filled out for the completion of my study, "A Follow-Up Study of Business Education Graduates of Utah State University, 1969-1976."

The study can be of great value to the department of Business Education and to future students if it is completed and the results valid. If the information needed is obtained, the study can be useful in the evaluation and revision of the program and course offerings of the Utah State Business Education Department. Will you, therefore, help make this study valid by adding your input?

If you have already mailed your questionnaire I thank you for your assistance. If for any reason you have not previously received or mailed the questionnaire, it would be greatly appreciated if you would fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Cynthia Olsen Krebs

Cynthia Olsen Krebs
Dept. of Business Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Business
UMC 35, LOGAN, UT 84322
June 1, 1977

Denise Grandy Knight
196 West 3rd North
Smithfield, UT

Dear Denise,

Please! Your help is urgently needed! It is necessary for the enclosed questionnaire to be filled out by you as soon as possible. This questionniare is to be used in my study, "A Follow-Up Study of Business Education Graduates of Utah State University, 1969-1976."

The study can be of great value to the department of Business Education and to future students if it is completed and the results valid. If the information needed is obtained, the study can be useful in the evaluation and revision of the program and course offerings of the Utah State University Business Education Department. Will you, therefore, help make this study valid by adding your input?

If you have already mailed your questionnaire, I thank you. If for any reason you have not previously received or mailed the questionnaire, it would be greatly appreciated if you would fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Cynthia O. Krebs

Cynthia Olsen Krebs
Dept. of Business Education

(This same letter was used for the June 22 and July 15 mailings.)

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

BUSINESS EDUCATION GRADUATES, 1969-1976

The following information is needed to complete an evaluation of the curricular offerings in Business Education. Plsease answer each question by checking the appropriate space. All responses will be considered confidential.

1. In what year did you graduate?
   - ____ a. 1969
   - ____ b. 1970
   - ____ c. 1971
   - ____ d. 1972
   - ____ e. 1973
   - ____ f. 1974
   - ____ g. 1975
   - ____ h. 1976

EMPLOYMENT

2. Are you currently employed in one of the following areas?
   - ____ a. Teaching
   - ____ b. Business
   - ____ c. Other

3. Do you now hold a teaching certificate?
   - ____ a. Yes
   - ____ b. No

4. If no, have you ever held a teaching certificate?
   - ____ a. Yes
   - ____ b. No

5. When did you first receive your teaching certificate?
   - ____ a. At graduation
   - ____ b. Within one year
   - ____ c. Within two years
   - ____ d. Within four years
   - ____ e. Have not yet received

6. When did you first enter the teaching profession?
   - ____ a. 1969
   - ____ b. 1970
   - ____ c. 1971
   - ____ d. 1972
   - ____ e. 1973
   - ____ f. 1974
   - ____ g. 1975
   - ____ h. 1976
   - ____ i. Not applicable

PLEASE FILL OUT BOTH SIDES OF EACH PAGE

7. How many years have you taught, excluding your student teaching?
   ____ a. Up to one year
   ____ b. Two years
   ____ c. Three years
   ____ d. Four years
   ____ e. Five years
   ____ f. Six years
   ____ g. Seven years
   ____ h. Eight years
   ____ i. Never

8. Have you done any substitute teaching since graduation?
   ____ a. Yes
   ____ b. No

9. Generally, what is your teaching assignment? Indicate by marking number of times you teach the class. Example: If you teach three typewriting classes, mark 3 a. Typewriting

   Skilled
   ____ a. Typewriting
   ____ b. Shorthand
   ____ c. Business Machines
   ____ d. Office Practice
   ____ e. Other_____(Please Specify)

   Non-skilled
   ____ a. General Business
   ____ b. Business Law
   ____ c. Accounting
   ____ d. Economic Education
   ____ e. Other_____(Please Specify)

10. Have you taught in a subject matter area other than business?
    ____ a. Yes
    ____ b. No

If you have been employed in one of the following occupations since graduation, please indicate the length of time after each occupation by checking the appropriate space.

	1 year or less	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	6 years	7 years
a. Purchasing Management							
b. Personnel & Training Management							
c. Public Relations Management							
d. Sales Occupations							
e. Secretary							
f. Stenographer							
g. Typist							
h. Correspondence Clerk							
i. File Clerk							
j. Bookkeeper							
k. Cashier							
l. Teller							
m. Duplicating Machine Operator							

If you have been employed in one of the following occupations since graduation, please indicate the length of time after each occupation by checking the appropriate space.

		1 year or less	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	6 years	7 years
n.	Computer Operator							
o.	Misc. Office Machine Operator							
p.	Billing Machine Operator							
q.	Automatic Data Processing Equipment Operator							
r.	Computing and Acct. Recorder							
s.	Accounting Records Machine Operator							
t.	Other_____ (Please Specify)							

EDUCATION

11. Do you plan on completing a graduate program?
    - ____ a. Yes
    - ____ b. No
    - ____ c. Undecided
    - ____ d. Have already completed an advanced degree (Skip to 14)

12. If yes, in what field would you earn the advanced degree?
    - ____ a. Business Education
    - ____ b. Business Administration
    - ____ c. Distributive Education
    - ____ d. Other _____(Please Specify)

13. If yes, what advanced degree will you seek?
    - ____ a. M.S.
    - ____ b. M.A.
    - ____ c. M.B.A.
    - ____ d. M.E.
    - ____ e. Ed.D.
    - ____ f. Ph.D.
    - ____ g. Other _____(Please Specify)

14. If you have already completed an advanced degree, in what field did you earn it?
    - ____ a. Business Education
    - ____ b. Business Administration
    - ____ c. Distributive Education
    - ____ d. Other _____(Please Specify)

15. Which of the following degrees did you earn?
    - ____ a. M.S.
    - ____ b. M.A.
    - ____ c. M.B.A.
    - ____ d. M.E.
    - ____ e. Ed.D.
    - ____ f. Ph.D.
    - ____ g. Other _____(Please Specify)

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Please indicate by checking the appropriate space the value you feel each of the following courses has been to you in your chosen field.

	Extremely Beneficial	Very Beneficial	Of Average Benefit	Little Benefit	No Benefit	Did Not Take
Secretarial Training						
a. Beginning Typewriting						
b. Intermediate Typewriting						
c. Advanced Typewriting						
d. Fundamentals of Shorthand, I						
e. Fundamentals of Shorthand, II						
f. Fundamentals of Shorthand, III						
g. Dictation and Transcription						
h. Secretarial Procedures						
i. Office Data Systems						
j. Business Machines						
k. Office Practice						
l. Office Management						
Business Education						
a. Managing Personal Finances						
b. Business Communications						
c. Principles of Business Education						
d. Methods of Teaching Basic Business						
e. Methods of Teaching Typewriting						
f. Methods of Teaching Cooperative Ed.						
g. Methods of Teaching Shorthand						
h. Simulation Methods						
Business Administration						
a. Business Law, I						
b. Business Law, II						
c. Business Law, III						
d. Fundamentals of Marketing						
e. Business Statistics						
f. Management Concepts						
g. Corporation Finance						
h. Financial Institutions						
i. Behavioral Dimensions of Management						
j. Personnel Adminstration						
Professional Education						
a. Educational & Psychological Statistics						
b. Educational Psychology						

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Please indicate by checking the appropriate space the value you feel each of the following courses have been to you in your chosen field.

Professional Education

		Extremely Beneficial	Very Beneficial	Of Average Benefit	Little Benefit	No Benefit	Did Not Take
c.	Foundation Studies in Education						
d.	Principles of Secondary Education						
e.	School Health for Secondary Teachers						
f.	Improvement of Reading						
g.	Field Based Experience						
h.	Field Based Problems						
i.	Student Teaching Seminar						
j.	Student Teaching						
k.	Post Student Teaching Seminar						

Other Course Work

a.	Introductory Accounting, I						
b.	Introductory Accounting, II						
c.	Economics I						
d.	Economics II						
e.	Introduction to Computer Science						
f.	Programming Business Problems						

17. What do you feel are the specific strengths and weaknesses of the Business Education Program at Utah State University?

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

Comments Concerning the Undergraduate Degree Program

in Business Education at Utah State University

"I think the professors and other personnel (secretaries, etc.) are great! They were always very interested and concerned with the students."

"The classes required through the College of Education should be very beneficial to a potential teacher, but they aren't, mainly because the people teaching them are not model teachers like I think they should be."

"I feel the direct Business Education Departmental Classes and some of the Business Administration classes were good. I feel the education and psychology classes required are unrealistic. I feel more time in Student Teaching gives a better view of the realistic situations."

"Excellent staff, very easy to work with. The department is very close and tries to work together."

"Adequate program. I have not taught, but worked as a secretary and a loan officer in a bank, and the things I learned in college were very helpful."

"Secretarial programs very useful both in education and as a skill. I learned more from the Business Methods courses than from professional education course, other than student teaching."

"Business Administration classes are useless. I have never had to use any of the knowledge from these classes, especially corporate finance, marketing and management classes."

"Some of the classes required are a lot of busy work and not worth a whole lot--Principles of Secondary Education and Educational Psychology."

"In general, USU and mostly the BE department are great, and a great place to come from."

"Methods of non-skill (Business Law, Personal Finance classes) is too general. It taught me things I needed to know in human relations, but not near enough about the various subject matters needed in order to effectively teach in non-skill areas."

"Instead of requiring Corporation Finance, let the BE majors take something that would help them teach non-skill subjects. Corporation Finance has relatively little use in a high school teaching situation."

"I feel that overall Utah State has the most valuable BE program I have seen. A couple of BA classes (i.e. Marketing and Corporate Finance) were there for BA purposes only and not to benefit those "7th floor dropouts. I'm glad to see more methods classes both pre and post student teaching. The staff is the biggest thing going for the program. At all times, as

well as the present time, I realize their concern for our successful careers and strive to help in reaching goals in any way possible. One small problem I've had is certifying in a defferent state. After I completed state constitution and U. S. constitution tests I had to complete a course entitled "Multi-cultural society". Possibly, if there is a way to broaden or include an overall course such as Constitution (as recommended) it might be a great help after graduation. My methods classes were by far the most valuable to me, but the secretarial courses helped to refresh me in skills, as I am now having to use them to earn a living."

"Expertice of the people responsible for instructing is a definite strength. I learned from and enjoyed the classes I had."

"During my upper graduate work, the biggest strength was the caliber of teaching professors there during 1973-74. Their professionalism gave me incentive to do my best."

"I had a very bad student teaching experience. One teacher almost convinced me I could never teach. Better selection of teachers for this experience could help. As a contrast, my student teaching at another school was very rewarding."

"My student teaching was a disasterous experience. Too much long travel time to seminars, too much written busy work, and too many conflicts with the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. Trying to please two people with conflicting views on methods was almost overwhelming."

"I feel I wasted my time in some of the general "Professional Education" classes. The concepts taught there are either so general or aged as to be useless. There needs to be a class taught on class discipline with discussion and research on 'up-to-date' discipline problems."

"Need a class on how to repair business machines. You can save a lot of money for schools or offices if the teacher or secretary knows how to do minor repairs or understands what the problem is."

"Business Education professors while I attended the university were intellectual, professional, resourceful, and a real motivating influence. As I meet them now on a contemporary basis, I find them still concerned about my education and position. I've used a great deal of their techniques and methodology in my teaching, and I truly believe my students are better off for the training I received at Utah State."

"We need to learn how to accept responsibility for so much extracurricular work. I had no idea I would be so involved in outside school activities."

"Basic business methods were very weak. They did not help me as I went to do my student teaching."

"Corporate finance and statistics did not benefit me at all and were a waste of time."

"Student teaching experience was good. The only objection I had about the seminar we had to attend was that I felt it required more outside work that could have been spent being better prepared for each days teaching activities. I did feel that meeting together and discussing the different problems with other student teachers really helped."

"Faculty is very highly thought of and respected throughout the nation."

"The only thing I would recommend is that on the composite majors it should be stressed that the student get a minor in some area, as it is difficult to get credentials in other states without a minor."

"I feel a business teacher must be capable of teaching and understanding all facets of English in teaching business subfects properly. We cannot properly train secretaries without the ability to transfer to them the ability to spell, punctuate and make sentences grammatically correct.

I feel very strongly that I am weak in this area and failed to get enough exposure to basic concepts in my college program. I tried to get permission to take basic grammar while at USU and was told it wouldn't count toward graduation. I doubt that I could even take an English class of any kind and count it toward recertification."

"My student teaching was not the ideal situation--the only time the teacher I was working under came in to observe me was when my advisor from USU was down. I didn't feel she could give a fair evaluation of my work. The only reasons I felt like the teacher accepted student teachers was because whe was lazy, didn't enjoy teaching herself, and enjoyed the extra money she received that quarter. She had a student teacher every year. I feel USU has an obligation to carefully screen the teachers where they send student teachers, which obviously was not done in my situation. I feel they should get the best teachers possible to train their student teachers."

"It's not just USU per se. It's all major schools. All those silly Ed. Psy. courses--what a waste! I teach in California. One half the kids can't read on a 5th grade level--what preparation was there for that? You can't motivate 5th generation welfare cases with waffle parties.

Also, you should prepare potential teachers for the vague possibility that they may leave Cache Valley. You need a course in self defense, legal liabilities, crazed parents, and burnt out students with nothing left to lose--particularly when most of them show up in typing and in business machines."

"If I tell you what I thought was relevant in providing the foundation I had, or needed, for teaching experience, someone will argue the meaning of relevant. In my actual teaching experience accounting and economics were of no value, and I feel that my time would have been more profitably spent in practical courses such as methods of teaching."

"For a full-time housewife and mother, not all the classes were that beneficial. I will say that I've filed things away so well, I haven't found them for eight years, so I guess I file quite thoroughly!"

"It seems like years and years since I was involved with Business Education at USU, but I do remember very well how inadequately prepared I felt with my Business Education background. You have to take a lot of pure crap that you never use for your job. There was totally no effort to show you how to handle discipline problems; nothing in the social behavior of the age group you will be dealing with. Much of the time is spent in education classes that bore you to teach with trivia and B.S."

"You are taught to teach subjects, not people."

"While at USU, I felt the Business Education Program was a good one. I felt there was a great deal of strength and leadership from the department head. This influence seemed to unify and strengthen the entire teaching program. Most courses I took were fundamental and valuable for my teaching experience."

"One of the most obvious strengths is the teaching staff at USU. I can't say enough about the professionalism and quality of the teaching when I attended classes there. Also, the vocational conference I attended the summer of 1973 was well planned and executed. I assume that other programs are as useful as that conference.

One weakness is the lack of follow-up! I was happy to receive this questionnaire, but it is the first thing I have received from the business education department since I stopped teaching to become a mother. I plan to resume my teaching career one of these years and wish there was some communication between use to make my "re-entry" easier."

APPENDIX C

TABLES 19-65

Table 19. The degree of value graduates place on the course Beginning Typewriting

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	25	80.6	5	16.1	1	3.2	31
Business	14	70.0	6	30.0	0	0.0	20
Other	31	86.1	3	8.3	2	5.6	36
Two or More Occupations	10	71.4	3	21.4	1	7.1	14
No Response	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6
Totals	86	80.4	17	15.9	4	3.7	107

Chi Square = 37.074 Significance = 0.117

Table 20. The degree of value graduates place on the course Intermediate Typewriting

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	34	79.1	6	14.0	3	7.0	43
Business	18	69.2	7	26.9	1	3.8	26
Other	35	87.5	3	7.5	2	5.0	40
Two or More Occupations	12	70.6	4	23.5	1	5.9	17
No Response	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8
Totals	107	79.9	20	14.9	7	5.2	134

Chi Square = 28.362 Significance = 0.245

Table 21. The degree of value graduates place on the course Advanced Typewriting

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	36	69.2	12	23.1	4	7.7	52
Business	21	72.4	8	27.6	0	0.0	29
Other	35	87.5	2	5.0	3	7.5	40
Two or More Occupations	15	83.3	2	11.1	1	5.6	18
No Response	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0.0	8
Totals	114	77.6	25	17.0	8	5.4	147

Chi Square = 21.528 Significance = 0.607

Table 22. The degree of value graduates place on the course Shorthand I

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	26	76.5	5	14.7	3	8.8	34
Business	14	66.7	6	28.6	1	4.8	21
Other	23	67.6	5	14.7	6	17.6	34
Two or More Occupations	12	80.0	3	20.0	0	0.0	15
No Response	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6
Totals	80	72.7	19	17.3	11	10.0	110

Chi Square = 24.775 Significance = 0.418

Table 23. The degree of value graduates place on the course Shorthand II

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	30	78.9	4	10.5	4	10.5	38
Business	14	66.7	5	23.8	2	9.5	21
Other	24	68.6	6	17.1	5	14.3	35
Two or More Occupations	13	86.7	2	13.3	0	0.0	15
No Response	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6
Totals	86	74.8	17	14.8	12	10.4	115

Chi Square = 20.634 Significance = 0.660

Table 24. The degree of value graduates place on the course Shorthand III

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	33	78.6	6	14.3	3	7.1	42
Business	16	69.6	5	21.7	2	8.7	23
Other	24	64.9	8	21.6	5	13.5	37
Two or More Occupations	12	85.7	2	14.3	0	0.0	14
No Response	4	80.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	5
Totals	89	74.8	21	17.6	9	7.6	119

Chi Square = 22.447 Significance = 0.553

Table 25. The degree of value graduates place on the course Dictation and Transcription

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	32	74.4	8	18.6	3	7.0	43
Business	22	81.5	2	7.4	3	11.1	27
Other	26	72.2	4	11.1	6	16.7	36
Two or More Occupations	13	81.3	3	18.8	0	0.0	16
No Response	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6
Totals	98	76.6	18	14.1	12	9.4	128

Chi Square = 21.514 Significance = 0.608

Table 26. The degree of value graduates place on the course Secretarial Procedures

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	24	50.0	15	30.6	10	20.4	49
Business	18	64.3	8	28.6	2	7.1	28
Other	20	52.6	11	28.9	7	18.4	38
Two or More Occupations	6	33.3	7	38.9	5	27.8	18
No Response	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	6
Totals	71	51.1	42	30.2	26	18.7	139

Chi Square = 34.402 Significance = 0.078

Table 27. The degree of value graduates place on the course Office Data Systems

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	15	30.0	21	42.0	14	28.0	50
Business	13	50.0	10	38.5	3	11.5	26
Other	14	40.0	13	37.1	8	22.9	35
Two or More Occupations	5	31.3	6	37.5	5	31.3	16
No Response	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	7
Totals	49	36.6	53	39.6	32	23.9	134

Chi Square = 19.239 Significance = 0.739

Table 28. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Machines

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	27	50.0	18	33.3	9	16.7	54
Business	16	55.2	11	38.0	2	6.9	29
Other	21	51.2	13	31.7	7	17.1	41
Two or More Occupations	11	64.7	4	23.5	2	11.8	17
No Response	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8
Totals	80	53.7	47	31.5	22	14.8	149

Chi Square = 20.170 Significance = 0.687

Table 29. The degree of value graduates place on the course Office Practice

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	33	61.1	15	27.8	6	11.1	54
Business	17	60.7	9	32.1	2	7.1	28
Other	20	50.0	14	35.0	6	15.0	40
Two or More Occupations	9	50.0	3	16.7	6	33.3	18
No Response	6	75.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	8
Totals	85	57.4	42	28.4	21	14.2	148

Chi Square = 37.209 Significance = 0.042

Table 30. The degree of value graduates place on the course Office Management

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	21	41.2	20	39.2	10	19.6	51
Business	17	68.0	7	28.0	1	4.0	25
Other	14	36.8	14	36.8	10	26.3	38
Two or More Occupations	5	31.3	5	31.3	6	37.5	16
No Response	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	28.6	7
Totals	62	45.3	46	33.6	29	21.2	137

Chi Square = 38.363 Significance = 0.032

Table 31. The degree of value graduates place on the course Managing Personal Finances

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	25	52.1	16	33.3	7	14.6	48
Business	14	58.3	7	29.2	3	12.5	24
Other	18	46.2	16	41.0	5	12.8	39
Two or More Occupations	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2	9
No Response	9	52.9	3	17.6	5	29.4	17
Totals	73	53.3	42	30.6	22	16.1	137

Chi Square = 27.406 Significance = 0.496

Table 32. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Communications

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	31	58.5	16	30.2	6	11.3	53
Business	15	51.7	11	37.9	3	10.3	29
Other	22	53.7	13	31.7	6	14.6	41
Two or More Occupations	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
No Response	8	44.4	6	33.3	4	22.2	18
Totals	82	54.7	48	32.0	20	13.3	150

Chi Square = 20.543 Significance = 0.666

Table 33. The degree of value graduates place on the course Principles of Business Education

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	16	30.2	20	37.7	17	32.1	53
Business	4	15.4	10	38.5	12	46.2	26
Other	14	35.0	10	25.0	16	40.0	40
Two or More Occupations	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	9
No Response	3	16.7	9	50.0	6	33.3	18
Totals	40	27.4	52	35.6	54	37.0	146

Chi Square = 32.209 Significance = 0.266

Table 34. The degree of value graduates place on the course Methods of Teaching Basic Business

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	24	45.3	17	32.1	12	22.6	53
Business	11	42.3	6	23.1	9	34.6	26
Other	16	43.2	8	21.6	13	35.1	37
Two or More Occupations	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8
No Response	9	52.9	4	23.5	4	23.5	17
Totals	65	46.1	36	25.5	40	28.4	141

Chi Square = 24.506 Significance = 0.655

Table 35. The degree of value graduates place on the course Methods of Teaching Typewriting

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	50	90.9	4	7.3	1	1.8	55
Business	17	60.7	5	17.9	6	21.4	28
Other	27	65.9	3	7.3	11	26.8	41
Two or More Occupations	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7
No Response	13	68.4	5	26.3	1	5.3	19
Totals	112	74.7	18	12.0	20	13.3	150

Chi Square = 66.772 Significance = 0.000

Table 36. The degree of value graduates place on the course Methods of Teaching Cooperative Education

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	21	44.7	16	34.0	10	21.3	47
Business	5	23.8	5	23.8	11	52.4	21
Other	10	32.3	8	25.8	13	41.9	31
Two or More Occupations	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	7
No Response	5	35.7	4	28.6	5	35.7	14
Totals	47	39.2	34	28.3	39	32.5	120

Chi Square = 34.396 Significance = 0.188

Table 37. The degree of value graduates place on the course Methods of Teaching Shorthand

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	37	77.1	11	22.9	0	0.0	48
Business	13	52.0	4	16.0	8	32.0	25
Other	23	60.5	7	18.4	8	21.1	38
Two or More Occupations	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6
No Response	13	68.4	5	26.3	1	5.3	19
Totals	91	66.9	28	20.6	17	12.5	136

Chi Square = 42.981 Significance = 0.035

Table 38. The degree of value graduates place on the course Simulation Methods

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	17	56.7	9	30.0	4	13.3	30
Business	6	31.6	4	21.1	9	47.4	19
Other	12	48.0	7	28.0	6	24.0	25
Two or More Occupations	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	5
No Response	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
Totals	44	50.0	24	27.3	20	22.7	88

Chi Square = 32.350 Significance = 0.261

Table 39. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Law I

Occupation	Graduates Responding						
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		Total Response
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	18	32.7	25	45.6	12	21.8	55
Business	8	28.6	13	46.4	7	25.0	28
Other	11	26.2	20	47.6	11	26.2	42
Two or More Occupations	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
No Response	5	29.4	9	52.9	3	17.6	17
Totals	48	31.8	69	45.7	34	22.5	151

Chi Square = 20.081 Significance = 0.862

Table 40. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Law II

Occupation	Graduates Responding						
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		Total Response
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	14	29.2	25	52.1	9	18.8	48
Business	8	28.6	13	46.4	7	25.0	28
Other	10	25.6	19	48.7	10	25.6	39
Two or More Occupations	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3	7
No Response	5	31.3	8	50.0	3	18.8	16
Totals	41	29.7	67	48.6	30	21.7	138

Chi Square = 17.052 Significance = 0.948

Table 41. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Law III

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	10	27.8	19	52.8	7	19.4	36
Business	6	25.0	12	50.0	6	25.0	24
Other	8	23.4	17	50.0	9	26.5	34
Two or More Occupations	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	6
No Response	4	25.0	9	56.3	3	18.8	16
Totals	32	27.6	58	50.0	26	22.4	116

Chi Square = 23.299 Significance = 0.718

Table 42. The degree of value graduates place on the course Fundamentals of Marketing

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	9	17.6	22	43.1	20	39.2	51
Business	6	24.0	9	36.0	10	40.0	25
Other	7	18.9	17	45.9	13	35.1	37
Two or More Occupations	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	9
No Response	5	29.4	4	23.5	8	47.1	17
Totals	30	21.6	55	39.6	54	38.8	139

Chi Square = 23.494 Significance = 0.708

Table 43. The degree of value graduates place on the course Business Statistics

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	2	8.7	11	47.8	10	43.5	23
Business	1	12.5	4	50.0	3	37.5	8
Other	2	11.1	8	44.4	8	44.4	18
Two or More Occupations	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50.0	6
No Response	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0	8
Totals	9	14.3	24	38.1	30	47.6	63

Chi Square = 28.751 Significance = 0.425

Table 44. The degree of value graduates place on the course Management Concepts

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	8	21.1	17	44.7	13	34.2	38
Business	7	36.8	8	42.1	4	21.1	19
Other	4	15.4	13	50.0	9	34.6	26
Two or More Occupations	3	42.9	1	14.3	3	42.9	7
No Response	4	28.6	1	21.4	7	50.0	12
Totals	26	25.5	40	39.2	36	35.3	102

Chi Square = 26.893 Significance = 0.524

Table 45. The degree of value graduates place on the course Corporation Finance

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	2	6.3	11	34.4	19	59.4	32
Business	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	10
Other	2	10.0	7	35.0	11	55.0	20
Two or More Occupations	2	33.3	0	0.0	4	66.7	6
No Response	1	12.5	4	50.0	3	37.5	8
Totals	9	11.8	26	34.2	41	53.9	76

Chi Square = 35.233 Significance = 0.163

Table 46. The degree of value graduates place on the course Financial Institutions

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	2	12.5	8	50.0	6	37.5	16
Business	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6	9
Other	3	21.4	6	42.9	5	35.7	14
Two or More Occupations	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3
No Response	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	4
Totals	9	19.6	20	43.5	17	37.0	46

Chi Square = 28.998 Significance = 0.413

Table 47. The degree of value graduates place on the course Behavioral Dimensions

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	7	20.0	13	37.1	15	42.9	35
Business	4	30.8	5	38.5	4	30.8	13
Other	6	31.6	5	26.3	8	42.1	19
Two or More Occupations	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	6
No Response	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3	7
Totals	23	28.8	27	33.8	30	37.5	80

Chi Square = 25.628 Significance = 0.594

Table 48. The degree of value graduates place on the course Personnel Administration

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	11	35.5	13	41.9	7	22.6	31
Business	9	50.0	6	33.3	3	16.7	18
Other	11	33.3	12	36.4	10	30.3	33
Two or More Occupations	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	28.6	7
No Response	4	28.6	6	42.9	4	28.6	14
Totals	40	38.8	37	35.9	26	25.2	103

Chi Square = 29.042 Significance = 0.410

Table 49. The degree of value graduates place on the course Educational Statistics

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	3	9.7	11	35.5	17	54.8	31
Business	4	22.2	5	27.8	9	50.0	18
Other	2	10.0	6	30.0	12	60.0	20
Two or More Occupations	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	6
No Response	2	18.2	2	18.2	7	63.6	11
Totals	12	14.0	26	30.2	48	55.8	86

Chi Square = 19.180 Significance = 0.893

Table 50. The degree of value graduates place on the course Educational Psychology

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	10	19.2	20	38.5	22	42.3	52
Business	10	38.5	8	30.8	8	30.8	26
Other	8	20.0	14	35.0	18	45.0	40
Two or More Occupations	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3	9
No Response	3	20.0	4	26.7	8	53.3	15
Totals	32	22.5	51	35.9	59	41.5	142

Chi Square = 30.579 Significance = 0.336

Table 51. The degree of value graduates place on the course Foundation Studies in Education

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	5	17.9	15	53.6	8	28.6	28
Business	0	0.0	8	50.0	8	50.0	16
Other	4	14.3	6	21.4	18	64.3	28
Two or More Occupations	2	28.6	1	14.3	4	57.1	7
No Response	4	40.0	3	30.0	3	30.0	10
Totals	15	16.9	33	37.1	41	46.1	89

Chi Square = 26.818 Significance = 0.313

Table 52. The degree of value graduates place on the course Principles of Secondary Education

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	8	16.0	24	48.0	18	36.0	50
Business	3	13.0	10	43.5	10	43.5	23
Other	6	17.1	13	37.1	16	45.7	35
Two or More Occupations	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	7
No Response	6	35.2	4	23.5	7	41.2	17
Totals	24	18.2	54	40.9	54	40.9	132

Chi Square = 22.528 Significance = 0.548

Table 53. The degree of value graduates place on the course School Health for Secondary Teachers

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	11	28.9	18	47.4	9	23.7	38
Business	7	30.4	8	34.8	8	34.8	23
Other	6	22.2	14	51.9	7	26.0	27
Two or More Occupations	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	5
No Response	4	28.6	7	50.0	3	21.4	14
Totals	29	27.1	48	44.9	30	28.0	107

Chi Square = 14.099 Significance = 0.944

Table 54. The degree of value graduates place on the course Improvement of Reading

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	1	10.0	6	60.0	3	30.0	10
Business	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	5
Other	5	38.5	2	15.4	6	46.2	13
Two or More Occupations	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3
No Response	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	4
Totals	9	25.7	14	40.0	12	34.3	35

Chi Square = 25.244 Significance = 0.393

Table 55. The degree of value graduates place on the course Field Based Experience

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	8	50.0	5	31.3	3	18.8	16
Business	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4	9
Other	7	43.8	1	6.3	8	50.0	16
Two or More Occupations	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3
No Response	4	28.6	7	50.0	3	21.4	14
Totals	21	36.2	18	31.0	19	32.8	58

Chi Square = 20.515 Significance = 0.667

Table 56. The degree of value graduates place on the course Field Based Problems

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	2	16.7	6	50.0	4	33.3	12
Business	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	7
Other	6	37.5	1	6.3	9	56.3	16
Two or More Occupations	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3
No Response	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	4
Totals	10	23.8	15	35.7	17	40.5	42

Chi Square = 26.741 Significance = 0.317

Table 57. The degree of value graduates place on the course Student Teaching Seminar

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	19	33.9	22	39.3	15	26.8	56
Business	7	28.0	11	44.0	7	28.0	25
Other	20	50.0	6	15.0	14	35.0	40
Two or More Occupations	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4	9
No Response	7	36.8	5	26.3	7	36.8	19
Totals	54	36.2	48	32.2	47	31.5	149

Chi Square = 33.254 Significance = 0.099

Table 58. The degree of value graduates place on the course Student Teaching

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	46	85.2	7	13.0	1	1.9	54
Business	18	66.7	3	11.1	6	22.2	27
Other	30	73.2	0	0.0	11	26.8	41
Two or More Occupations	6	66.7	1	11.1	2	22.2	9
No Response	16	84.2	1	5.3	2	10.5	19
Totals	116	77.3	12	8.0	22	14.7	150

Chi Square = 31.738 Significance = 0.134

Table 59. The degree of value graduates place on the course Post Student Teaching Seminar

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	5	21.7	7	30.4	11	47.8	23
Business	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25.0	8
Other	10	50.0	2	10.0	8	40.0	20
Two or More Occupations	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3
No Response	5	50.0	1	10.0	4	40.0	10
Totals	23	35.9	16	23.4	26	40.6	64

Chi Square = 33.089 Significance = 0.102

Table 60. The degree of value graduates place on the course Accounting I

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	29	53.7	17	31.5	8	14.8	54
Business	19	67.9	9	32.1	0	0.0	28
Other	23	54.8	12	28.6	7	16.7	42
Two or More Occupations	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
No Response	8	44.4	7	38.9	3	16.7	18
Totals	85	56.3	47	31.1	19	12.6	151

Chi Square = 25.273 Significance = 0.391

Table 61. The degree of value graduates place on the course Accounting II

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	26	49.1	18	34.0	9	17.0	53
Business	17	60.7	10	35.7	1	3.6	28
Other	22	52.4	11	26.2	9	21.4	42
Two or More Occupations	6	66.7	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
No Response	8	44.4	4	22.2	6	33.3	18
Totals	79	52.7	45	30.0	26	17.3	150

Chi Square = 24.779 Significance = 0.418

Table 62. The degree of value graduates place on the course Economics I

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	20	37.0	21	38.9	13	24.1	54
Business	11	39.3	14	50.0	3	10.7	28
Other	13	31.7	15	36.6	13	31.7	41
Two or More Occupations	5	55.6	0	0.0	4	44.4	9
No Response	3	16.7	6	33.3	9	50.0	18
Totals	52	34.7	56	37.3	42	28.0	150

Chi Square = 36.631 Significance = 0.048

Table 63. The degree of value graduates place on the course Economics II

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	18	34.6	20	38.5	14	27.0	52
Business	10	35.7	15	53.6	3	10.7	28
Other	10	25.0	16	40.0	15	35.0	40
Two or More Occupations	4	44.4	1	11.1	4	44.4	9
No Response	3	17.6	5	29.4	9	52.9	17
Totals	45	30.8	57	39.0	44	30.1	146

Chi Square = 30.473 Significance = 0.170

Table 64. The degree of value graduates place on the course Introduction to Computer Science

Occupation	Graduates Responding: Ex. & Very Beneficial No.	%	Average No.	%	Little & No Benefit No.	%	Total Response
Teaching	14	28.6	17	34.7	18	36.7	49
Business	9	36.0	9	36.0	7	28.0	25
Other	10	25.0	8	20.0	22	55.0	40
Two or More Occupations	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.6	9
No Response	5	29.4	3	17.6	9	52.9	17
Totals	40	28.6	39	27.9	61	43.6	140

Chi Square = 19.584 Significance = 0.720

Table 65. The degree of value graduates place on the course Programming Business Problems

Occupation	Graduates Responding						Total Response
	Ex. & Very Beneficial		Average		Little & No Benefit		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Teaching	3	25.0	4	33.3	5	41.7	12
Business	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	5
Other	5	38.5	3	23.1	5	38.5	13
Two or More Occupations	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3
No Response	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	5
Totals	13	34.2	11	28.9	14	36.8	38

Chi Square = 14.628 Significance = 0.931

VITA

Cynthia Marie Olsen-Krebs

Master of Science

Thesis: A Follow-Up Study of the Utah State University Business Education Graduates Receiving Bachelors Degrees, 1969-1976.

Major Field: Business Education

Biographical Information

Personal Data: Born at Aurora Air Force Base, Colorado, September 20, 1955. Daughter of Reed J. Olsen and Zola Marie Waddoups.

Education: Graduated from Choctawhatchee High School, Ft. Walton Beach, Florida, 1973; received Bachelor of Science degree from Utah State University, Logan, Utah, with a major in Business Education, 1976; did graduate work in Business Education at Utah State University completing requirements for the Master of Science degree in Business Education, 1977.

Professional Experience: 1976-77, teaching assistant in the Business Education Department, Utah State University. Instructor, Secretarial Science, Dixie College, 1977-1978.